# Capitalism Kritik – CNDI 2014

## Negative

### 1NC

#### Ocean development and exploration continues capitalist pillage of the oceans.

PSL 13(PSL 5-31-13, Liberation Party for Socialism, <http://www.pslweb.org/liberationnews/newspaper/vol-7-no-7/the-pillaging-of-the-earths-oceans.html>, accessed 5-31-13

**The oceans of the world are vast and deep. They cover 71 percent of the Earth’s surface and contain 97 percent of the planet’s water. The oceans seem boundless in water, marine life and energy to sustain the planet’s life and atmosphere**. **But the oceans are experiencing profound stress, due to escalating factors directly related to capitalist production and the degradation of the environment.**

Alarming reports by marine scientists have been sounding the danger to the world’s oceans and the need for urgent action. The International Programme on the State of the Ocean (IPSO) warns that “**massive marine extinction” already may be underway due to rapidly worsening stresses on marine ecosystems. But, as capitalism’s search for profits intensifies, the devastation of the oceans is only accelerating.** Three main stresses — global warming, acidification of the oceans, and decreased oxygen —have led to such declines in many of the marine ecosystems that the conditions have met or surpassed “worst-case scenarios” predicted in the first decade of this 21st century.IPSO stated in 2011, **“[W]e now face losing marine species and entire marine ecosystems, such as coral reefs, within a single** generation. Unless action is taken now, the consequences of our activities are at a high risk of causing, through the combined effects of climate change, overexploitation, pollution and habitat loss, the next globally significant extinction event in the ocean. It is notable that the occurrence of multiple high intensity stressors has been a prerequisite for all the five global extinction events of the past 600 million years.” **Such a catastrophe would, needless to say, affect humanity and all life on Earth. Yet capitalists have rejected in international forums even basic accords to limit the exploitation of the oceans or to slow down the belching of fossil fuels into the environment. By far the biggest abuser of the environment is the United States**

#### Working within the capitalist system for ocean development and exploration only ensures continuous environmental exploitation.

Clausen 08 [‘The Oceanic Crisis: Capitalism and the Degradation of the Marine Ecosystems’, by Brett Clarkkand Rebbeca Clausen.. Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine. Jul/Aug2008, Vol. 60 Issue 3, p91-111. 21pg.]

The world is at a crossroads in regard to the ecological crisis. Ecological degradation under global capitalism extends to the entire biosphere. **Oceans that were teeming with abundance are being deci- mated by the continual intrusion of exploitive economic operations**. At the same time that scientists are documenting the complexity and interdependency of marine species, **we are witnessing an oceanic crisis as natural conditions, ecological processes, and nutrient cycles are being undermined through overfishing and transformed due to global warming.** **The expansion of the accumulation system,** along with tech- nological advances in fishing, **have intensified the exploitation of the world ocean**; facilitated the enormous capture of fishes (both target and bycatch); extended the spatial reach of fishing operations; broadened the species deemed valuable on the market; and **disrupted metabolic and reproductive processes of the ocean. The quick-fix solution of aquaculture enhances capital’s control over production without re- solving ecological contradictions.** It is wise to recognize, as Paul Burkett has stated, that “**short of human extinction, there is no sense in which capitalism can be relied upon to permanently ‘break down’ under the weight of its depletion and degradation of natural wealth.”Capital is driven by the competition for the accumulation of wealth, and short-term profits provide the immediate pulse of capitalism**. It **cannot operate under conditions that require reinvestment in the reproduction of nature, which may entail time scales of a hundred or more years. Such requirements stand op posed to the immediate interests of profit. The qualitative relation between humans and nature is subsumed under the drive to accumulate capital on an ever-larger scale**. Marx lamented that to capital, “Time is everything, man is nothing; he is at the most, time’s carcase. Quality no longer matters. Quantity alone decides everything.”Productive relations are concerned with production time, labor costs, and the circulation of capital—not the diminish- ing conditions of existence. Capital subjects natural cycles and processes (via controlled feeding and the use of growth hormones) to its economic cycle. **The maintenance of natural conditions is not a concern. The bounty of nature is taken for granted and appropriated as a free gift**. As a result, **the system is inherently caught in a fundamental crisis arising from the transformation and destruction of nature.** István Mészáros elaborates this point, stating: For today it is impossible to think of anything at all concerning the ele-mentary conditions of social metabolic reproduction which is not lethally threatened by the way in which capital relates to them—the only way in which it can. This is true not only of humanity’s energy requirements, or of the management of the planet’s mineral resources and chemical potentials, but of every facet of the global agriculture, including the devastation caused by large scale de-forestation, and even the most irresponsible way of dealing with the element without which no human being can survive: water itself....In the absence of miraculous solutions, capital’s arbitrarily self-asserting attitude to the objective determinations of causality and time in the end inevitably brings a bitter harvest, at the expense of humanity [and nature itself].

#### The alternative is to vote negative to refuse to participate in the violent logic of capitalism.

Herod 04 (James, <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/4thEd/4-index.htm>, Getting Free, 4th Edition)

**It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism.** This strategy, at its most basic, **calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization.** **The image then is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells.** This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. **Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We *stop participating* in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and *start participating* in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations**. In **this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done.** This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There *is* no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). **Capitalism must be *explicitly refused* and replaced by something else. T**his constitutes *War*, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. **This strategy does not call for *reforming* capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for *replacing* capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system.** **Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else.** Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must *want something else* and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. **Otherwise we are doomed to** perpetual slavery and possibly even **to extinction.**

### Link – Economy

#### Their scenario for economic collapse is rooted in capitalist ideology. By misdiagnosing the problem as the result of temporary circumstance rather than structural contradictions they reify the system.

Meszaros 95 Istavan, Prof. Emeritus @ Univ. Sussex, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition, London: Merlin Press, pg 105-6

The reason why capital is structurally incapable of addressing causes as causes—in contrast to treating all newly arising challenges and complications as more or less successfully manipulatable effects—is because it happens to be its own causal foundation: a varitable, unholy ‘causa sui’. Anything that might aspire at socioeconomic legitimacy and viability must be accompanied within its predetermined structural framework. For as a mode of social metabolic control capital cannot tolerate the intrusion of any principle of socioeconomic regulation that might constrain its expansion-oriented dynamics. Indeed, expansion as such is not simply a relative—to a greater or lesser extent commendable, and in that light under certain circumstances freely adopted whereas under other consciously rejected—economic function but an absolutely necessary way of displacing the capital system's emerging problems and contradictions, in accord with the imperative of avoiding like plague their underlying causes. The self propelling causal foundations of the system cannot be questioned under any circumstance. If troubles appear in it, they must be treated as temporary ‘disfunctions’, to be remedied by reasserting with ever greater rigour the imperative of expanded reproduction. It is for this reason that there can be no alternative to the pursuit of expansion—at all cost—in all varieties of the capital system. So long ad the scope for unobstructed expansion is objectively present, the process of displacing the system’s contradictions can go on unhindered. When things do not go well, i.e., when there is a failure in economic growth and corresponding advancement, the difficulties are diagnosed in terms of the circular proposition which runs away from the underlying causes and highlights only their consequences by saying that ‘there is not enough growth.’ Dealing with problems in this perverse circular way, constantly repeating even at times of major recessions that ‘everything is in place’ for healthy expansion, creates the illusion that capital’s mode of social metabolic control is in no need of fundamental change. Legitimate change must be always envisaged as limited alteration and improvement of what is already given. Change must be brought about by innovation undertaken strictly at the instrumental level, which is supposed to make it self evidently beneficial. Since, however, the necessary historical qualifying conditions and implications of continued expansion are systematically disregarded or brushed aside as irrelevant, the assumption of the permanence and unquestionable viability of capital's causa sui is utterly fallacious.

### Link – Energy

#### The argument that advances in energy efficiency will solve environmental destruction is ahistorical – energy savings empirically only accelerate capitalism’s ecological devastation.

Foster et al 10 [John Bellamy, prof of sociology @ U of Oregon, PhD in Political Science @ York University, Brett Clark and Richard York, 11/1/2010, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/capitalism-and-the-curse-of-energy-efficiency>]

The Jevons Paradox is the product of a capitalist economic system that is unable to conserve on a macro scale, geared, as it is, to maximizing the throughput of energy and materials from resource tap to final waste sink. **Energy savings in such a system tend to be used as a means for further development of the economic order, generating** what Alfred Lotka called the “**maximum energy flux,” rather than minimum energy production.34 The deemphasis** on absolute (as opposed to relative) energy **conservation is built into the nature and logic of capitalism as a system unreservedly devoted to the gods of production and profit**. As Marx put it: “Accumulate, accumulate! That is Moses and the prophets!”35 Seen in the context of a capitalist society, the **Jevons Paradox** therefore d**emonstrates the fallacy of** current **notions tha**t the **environmental problems facing society can be solved by** purely **technological means**. Mainstream environmental economists often refer to “dematerialization,” or the “decoupling” of economic growth, from consumption of greater energy and resources. **Growth in energy efficiency is often taken as a concrete indication that the environmental problem is being solved. Yet savings in materials and energy**, in the context of a given process of production, as we have seen, **are nothing new; they are part of the everyday history of capitalist developmen**t.36 **Each new steam engine**, as Jevons emphasized, **was more efficient than the one before**. “Raw materials-savings processes,” environmental sociologist Stephen Bunker noted, “are older than the Industrial Revolution, and they have been dynamic throughout the history of capitalism.” **Any notion that reduction in material throughput, per unit of national income, is a new phenomenon is therefore “profoundly ahistorical**.”37 What is neglected, then, in simplistic notions that **increased energy efficiency normally leads to increased energy savings overall**, is the reality of the Jevons Paradox relationship—through which **energy savings are used to promote new capital formation and the proliferation of commodities, demanding ever greater resources. Rather than an anomaly, the rule that efficiency increases energy and material use is integral to the “regime of capital” itself.**38 As stated in The Weight of Nations, an important empirical study of material outflows in recent decades in five industrial nations (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, the United States, and Japan): “Efficiency gains brought by technology and new management practices have been offset by [increases in] the scale of economic growth.”39 **The result is the production of mountains** upon mountains **of commodities, cheapening unit costs and** leading to **greater squandering of material resources**. Under monopoly capitalism, moreover, such **commodities** increasingly **take the form of artificial use values,** promoted by a vast marketing system and **designed to instill** ever **more demand for commodities** and the exchange values they represent—as a substitute for the fulfillment of genuine human needs. **Unnecessary, wasteful** goods are produced by useless toil to enhance purely economic values at the expense of the environment. Any slowdown in this process of ecological destruction, under the present system, spells economic disaster. In Jevons’s eyes, the “momentous choice” raised by a continuation of business as usual was simply “between brief but true [national] greatness and longer continued mediocrity.” He opted for the former—the maximum energy flux. A century and a half later, in our much bigger, more global—but no less expansive—economy, it is no longer simply national supremacy that is at stake, but the fate of the planet itself. To be sure, there are those who maintain that we should “live high now and let the future take care of itself.” To choose this course, though, is to court planetary disaster. The only real answer for humanity (including future generations) and the earth as a whole **is to alter the social relations of production, to create a system in which efficiency is no longer a curse—a higher system in which equality, human development, community, and sustainability are the explicit goals.**

### Link – Environmentalism

#### Focusing on the endpoint of the ecological crisis precludes understanding of its underlying capitalist causes – makes repeated environmental destruction inevitable.

Swyngedouw 6 (Erik, Department of Geography @ Manchester, *Urban and Landscape Perspectives* 9, 2, p.185-205, September)

The inability to take ‘natures’ seriously is dramatically illustrated by the controversy over the degree to which disturbing environmental change is actually taking place and the risks or dangers associated with it. Lomborg’s The Sceptical Environmentalist captures one side of this controversy in all its phantasmagorical perversity (Lomborg, 1998), while climate change doomsday pundits represent the other. Both sides of the debate argue from an imaginary position of the presumed existence of a dynamic balance and equilibrium, the point of ‘good’ nature, but one side claims that the world is veering off the correct path, while the other side (Lomborg and other sceptics) argues that we are still pretty much on nature’s course. With our gaze firmly fixed on capturing an imaginary ‘idealised’ Nature, the controversy further solidifies our conviction of the possibility of a harmonious, balanced, and fundamentally benign ONE Nature if we would just get our interaction with it right, an argument blindly (and stubbornly) fixed on the question of where Nature’s rightful point of benign existence resides. This futile debate, circling around an assumedly centred, known, and singular Nature, certainly permits -- in fact invites -- imagining ecological catastrophe at some distant point (global burning (or freezing) through climate change, resource depletion, death by overpopulation). Indeed, imagining catastrophe and fantasising about the final ecological Armageddon seems considerably easier for most environmentalists than envisaging relatively small changes in the socio-political and cultural-economic organisation of local and global life here and now. Or put differently, the world’s premature ending in a climatic Armageddon seems easier to imagine (and sell to the public) than a transformation of (or end to) the neo-liberal capitalist order that keeps on practicing expanding energy use and widening and deepening its ecological footprint.

### Link – Hegemony

#### Hegemony maintains a system of imperialist capital that privileges the few elites at risk of extinction.

Foster 6(John Bellamy, Prof of Sociology @ U of Oregon, PhD in Political Science @ York University, “The New Geopolitics of Empire” 2006, Monthly Review Vol. 57.8 January JF)

**U.S. imperial geopolitics is ultimately aimed at creating a global space for capitalist development. It is about forming a world dedicated to capital accumulation on behalf of the U.S. ruling class**—and to a lesser extent the interlinked ruling classes of the triad powers as a whole (North America, Europe, and Japan). Despite “the end of colonialism” and the rise of “anti-capitalist new countries,” Business Week pronounced in April 1975, there has always been “the umbrella of American power to contain it….[T]he U.S. was able to fashion increasing prosperity among Western countries, using the tools of more liberal trade, investment, and political power. The rise of the multinational corporation was the economic expression of this political framework.”36 There is no doubt that **the U.S. imperium has benefited those at the top of the center-capitalist nations and not just the power elite of the United States.** Yet, **the drive for global hegemony on the part of particular capitalist nations and their ruling** classes, like capital accumulation itself, recognizes **no** insurmountable **barriers**. Writing before September 11, 2001, István Mészáros argued in his Socialism or Barbarism that due to unbridled U.S. imperial ambitions **the world was entering what was potentially “the most dangerous phase of imperialism in all history”: For what is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet**—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, **but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower….This is what the ultimate rationality of globally developed capital requires,** in its vain attempt to bring under control its irreconcilable antagonisms. The trouble is, though, that **such rationality…is at the same time the most extreme form of irrationality in history, including the Nazi conception of world domination, as far as the conditions required for the survival of humanity are concerned.37 In the present era of naked imperialism,** initiated by the sole superpower, **the nature of the threat to the entire planet and its people is there for all to see.** According to G. John Ikenberry, Professor of Geopolitics and Global Justice at Georgetown University, in his 2002 Foreign Affairs article “America’s Imperial Ambition”: the U.S. “neoimperial vision” is one in which “the United States arrogates to itself the global role of setting standards, determining threats, using force, and meting out justice.” **At present the United States currently enjoys both economic** (though declining) **and military primacy. “The new goal**,” he states, “**is to make these advantages permanent**—a fait accompli that will prompt other states to not even try to catch up. Some thinkers have described the strategy as ‘breakout.’” Yet, such a “hard-line imperial grand strategy,” according to Ikenberry—himself no opponent of imperialism—could backfire.38 The foregoing suggests that **interimperialist rivalry did not end as is often thought with the rise of U.S. hegemony**. Rather **it has persisted in Washington’s drive to unlimited hegemony, which can be traced to the underlying logic of capital in a world divided into competing nation states**. The United States as the remaining superpower is today seeking final world dominion. **The “Project for the New American Century” stands for an attempt to create a U.S.-led global imperium geared to extracting as much surplus as possible from the countries of the peripher**y, while achieving a “breakout” strategy with respect to the main rivals (or potential rivals) to U.S. global supremacy. **The fact that such a goal is irrational and impossible to sustain constitutes the inevitable failure of geopolitics.**

#### US hegemony is synonymous with global capitalistic domination directing the world towards nuclear war and ecological destruction

Foster 5-Professor of Sociology @ the University of Oregon, Editor of the Monthly Review, PhD in Political Science @ York University [John, Monthly Review, “Naked Imperialism,” http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm]

**The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present**: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of **nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction**. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” **The nation with the greatest** conventional **military force an**d the **willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge** its **global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force** and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—**raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue. The U**nited **S**tates **is seeking to exercise sovereign authority** over the planet **during** a time of **widening** global crisis: **economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poo**r, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China, that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” **Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality**, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, **foreshadow** what is potentially **the most dangerous period in** the **history** of imperialism. **The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Ye**t it is important to remember that **nothing in** the development of human **history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the** global **struggle for** a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and **sustainable society.**

### Link – Nuclear War

#### Nuclear war is solely a bourgeoisie concern – identifying it as an existential threat is a tactic of racist capitalism.

Martin 82 (Brian, Prof of Social Sciences at the U of Wollongong, Australia, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 287-300)

(g) White, western orientation. Most of the continuing large-scale suffering in the world - caused by poverty, starvation, disease and torture - is borne by the poor, non-white peoples of the third world. A global nuclear war might well kill fewer people than have died of starvation and hunger-related disease in the past 50 or 100 years.[22] Smaller nuclear wars would make this sort of contrast greater.[23] Nuclear war is the one source of possible deaths of millions of people that would affect mainly white, rich, western societies (China and Japan are the prime possible exceptions). By comparison, the direct effect of global nuclear war on nonwhite, poor, third world populations would be relatively small. White westerners may tend to identify their own plight with that of the rest of the world, and hence exaggerate the threat of destruction wreaked on their own societies into one for all of humanity. White westerners may also tend to see the rest of the world as vitally dependent on themselves for survival, and hence see catastrophe for all as a result of a nuclear war which destroys 'civilisation'. In practice, poor non-white populations arguably would be better off without the attentions of white, western 'civilisation' - although nuclear war is hardly the way to achieve this. These considerations suggest the importance of strengthening links between peace struggles and struggles for justice, equality and freedom from exploitation in poor countries.

### Link – Oceans

#### Working within the capitalist system continues the exploitation of the Ocean.

Clausen, 08 [‘The Oceanic Crisis: Capitalism and the Degradation of the Marine Ecosystems’, by Brett Clarkkand Rebbeca Clausen.. Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine. Jul/Aug2008, Vol. 60 Issue 3, p91-111. 21pg.]

The findings are clear: **No area of the world ocean “is unaffected by human influence,”** **and over 40 percent of marine ecosystems are heavily affected by multiple factors. Polar seas are on the verge of significant change. Coral reefs and continental shelves have suffered severe deterioration.** Additionally, t**he world ocean is a crucial factor in the carbon cycle, absorbing approximately a third to a half of the carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere. The increase in the portion of carbon dioxide has led to an increase in ocean temperature and a slow drop in the pH of surface waters—making them more acidic—disrupting shell-forming plankton and reef-building species.** Furthermore, invasive species have negatively affected 84 percent of the world’s coastal waters—decreasing biodiversity and further undermining already stressed fisheries. Scientific analysis of oceanic systems presents a sobering picture of the coevolution of human society and the marine environment during the capitalist industrial **era. The particular environmental problems related to the ocean cannot be viewed as isolated issues or aberrations of human ingenuity, only to be corrected through further technological development. Rather these ecological conditions must be understood as they relate to the systematic expansion of capital and the exploitation of nature for profit. Capital has a particular social metabolic order—the material interchange between society and nature—that subsumes the world to the logic of accumulation. It is a system of self-expanding value, which must reproduce itself on an ever-larger scale.**

#### The ocean is the new frontier to enrich the pockets of capitalists, exploration and development will always be utilized towards that aim.

Farrell, 13 Market Watch: The wall Street Journal, writer, 13 (Rob, 4-23-13, Indian Country Today, www.marketwatch.com/story/10-ways-capitalists-get-rich-destroying-our-oceans-2013-12-04, accessed 6-29-8, AFB)

Yes, many capitalists are getting rich off **the high seas, a vast reservoir of wealth holding 95% of the planet’s water, spanning 70% of the Earth’s surface.** Often called the last frontier, **a return to America’s 18th century Wild West. it’s virtually unregulated, a new free market where capitalists roam like pirates, plundering wealth and treating our oceans as a freebie gold mine and trash dump. Bad news for seven billion people living on the planet. And by 2050 we’ll be adding three billion more people. We already know we can’t feed 10 billion. Now we’re polluting their water. Won’t be enough clean water for all to drink, triggering wars.** Yes, bad news getting worse: As [Alan Sielen of the Scripps Institute of Oceanography](http://cmbc.ucsd.edu/People/Faculty_and_Researchers/sielen/) warns in the Foreign Affairs journal: “Over the last several decades, human activities have so altered the basic chemistry of the seas that they are now experiencing evolution in reverse: a return to the barren primeval waters of hundreds of millions of years ago.” Evolution in reverse? Yes, planet Earth is regressing eons to an earlier primitive era. Unregulated free-market competition on the high seas is turning back the evolutionary clock. That doesn’t bother today’s short-term-thinking capitalists. But it should. Because, ironically, shifting evolution into reverse will also self-destruct the very global economy that capitalism needs for future growth. Today’s capitalists see another three billion people as the new customers needed to expand free markets globally. But in the process they are also cutting their own throats, unaware they’re pushing a hidden self-destruct button lodged in their brains. Nature designed all systems with these built-in termination buttons. Deny it all you want, but humans have our entrances and exits, as Shakespeare said. We all do. Same with economic systems: Yale’s Immanuel Wallerstein sees capitalism at the end of its 500-year cycle. Solar systems last for billions of years. Someday, as our sun cools, Earth could go the way of Mars. And the sun will eventually exit in a blazing supernova. Capitalists deny their role in their endgame, dismiss the long economic cycle. That’s natural. **Capitalist brains are designed to focus on the short term, profits, high frequencies, microseconds, day-end closing prices, quarterly earnings, annual bonuses. Rarely longer. Myopia is the built-in self-destruct trigger for capitalists, their society, the human race, our planet’s water. Can’t blame them, the capitalist’s brain isn’t designed to think long-term. Why? Capitalists see a new world like the Wild West. No lawmen, just free-market competitors, free to do whatever they want, whenever, unregulated, uncontrolled, no restraints, skimming, mining, plundering the wealth of the high seas, free to use, misuse and abuse vast oceans of water at no real cost.**

### Link – Security

#### The securitization of the 1AC is the bourgeois attempt to push forward the ultimate capitalist agenda to construct threats in order to justify conservatism

Neocleous 8 Professor of Critique of Political Economy @ Brunel University [Mark, “Critique of Security”, Brunel University in the Department of Government, 2008]

We are often and rightly told that security is intimately associated with the rise of the modem state. But we also need to note that it is equally intimately bound up with the rise of bourgeois property rights and a liberal order-building, and in later chapters we will see the extent of this intimacy. In this way liberalism's conception of security was intimately connected to its vision of political subjectivitycentred 1 on the self-contained and property-owning individual. The reason liberty is wrapped in the concept of security, then, is because security is simultaneously wrapped in the question of property, giving us a triad of concepts which are usually run so close together that they are almost conflated ('liberty, security, property'), a triad found in Smith, j Blackstone, Paine, the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, and in various other formulations elsewhere.' Thus as liberalism generated a new conception of 'the economy' as its founding political act, a conception which integrated the wealth of nations, the world market and the labour of the population, its notion of liberty necessitated a particular vision of security: the ideological guarantee of the egoism of the independent and self-interested pursuit of property. It is for this  reason Marx calls security 'the supreme concept of bourgeois society'.' Marx spotted that as the concept of bourgeois society, security plays a double role: The progress of social wealth,' says Storch 'begets this useful class of society . . . which performs the most wearisome, the vilest, the most disgusting functions, which, in a word takes on its shoulders all that is disagreeable and servile in life, and procures thus for other classes leisure, serenity of mind and conventional' (c'est bon, ca) 'dignity of character'. Storch then asks himself what the actual advantage is of this capitalist civilization, with its misery and its degradation of the masses, as compared with barbarism. He can find only one answer: security!  One side of this double role, then, is that security is the ideological justification for 'civilisation' (that is, capitalism) as opposed to 'barbarism' (that is, non-capitalist modes of production); hence Locke's need to move from the 'state of nature' to the state of civil society. The other side is that security is what the bourgeois class demand once it has exploited, demoralised and degraded the bulk of humanity. For all the talk of 'laissez faire', the 'natural' phenomena of labour, wages and profit have to be policed and secured. Thus security entails the concept of police, guaranteeing as well as presupposing that society exists to secure the conservation of a particular kind of subjectivity (known as 'persons') and the rights and property associated with this subjectivity." The non-liberal and non-capitalist may be 'tolerated' - that other classically liberal concept which also functions as a regulatory power - but they will also be heavily policed ... for 'security reasons'? The new form of economic reason to which liberalism gave birth also gave new content to the idea of reason of state and thus a new rationale for state action: the 'free economy'. In other words, if security is the supreme concept of bourgeois society it is equally the supreme concept of liberal ideology.

### Link – State

#### Using the state strengthens and legitimizes the capitalist system.

Glassman 4 (Jim, Department of Geography, University of British Columbia, “Transnation hegemony and US labor foreign policy: towards a Gramscian international labor geography”, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, volume 22, pages 573-593 BSH)

Whilst previously neglected, it is clear that Antonio Gramsci advanced a conception of the state within a broader Marxist approach to political economy that he referred to as 'Critical Economy'.[8](file:///C:\Users\HakeemMuhammad\Downloads\Capitalism_Kritik_Supplement___CNDI_2012%20(1).docx#en8) For Gramsci, a 'Critical Economy' approach was distinguished from the 'Classical Economy' of Adam Smith and David Ricardo in that it did not seek to construct abstract hypotheses based on generalised, historically indeterminate conditions of a generic 'homo oeconomicus' **(**[**Gramsci 1995**](file:///C:\Users\HakeemMuhammad\Downloads\Capitalism_Kritik_Supplement___CNDI_2012%20(1).docx#b71)**, 166–167). The whole** conception of 'Critical Economy' was historicist in the sense that categories were always situated within historical circumstances and assessed within the particular context from which they derived, rather than assuming a universal 'homo oeconomicus' (ibid., 171–173, 176–179). Moreover, the importance of a theory of value was acknowledged to the extent that: one must take as one's starting point the labour of all working people to arrive at definitions both of their role in economic production and of the abstract, scientific concept of value and surplus value, as well as ... the role of all capitalists considered as an ensemble (ibid., 168). This distancing from liberal ideology was then continued in Gramsci's direct reflections on the state. According to Gramsci, the conception of the state developed by dominant classes within capitalist social relations derived from a separation of politics and economics. 'The state', as represented by the intellectual class supportive of dominant social forces, 'is conceived as a thing in itself, as a rational absolute' ([Gramsci 1992](file:///C:\Users\HakeemMuhammad\Downloads\Capitalism_Kritik_Supplement___CNDI_2012%20(1).docx#b67), 229). Additionally, in those situations when individuals view a collective entity such as the state to be extraneous to them, then the relation is a reified or fetishistic one. It is fetishistic when individuals consider the state as a thing and expect it to act and, are led to think that in actual fact there exists above them a phantom entity, the abstraction of the collective organism, a species of autonomous divinity that thinks, not with the head of a specific being, yet nevertheless thinks, that moves, not with the real legs of a person, yet still moves ([Gramsci 1995](file:///C:\Users\HakeemMuhammad\Downloads\Capitalism_Kritik_Supplement___CNDI_2012%20(1).docx#b71), 15).

### Impact – Ethics

#### You have an a priori ethical obligation to reject capitalism – utilitarian rationality cannot account for the degraded life chances of billions because capital makes its victims anonymous.

Zizek & Daly 4 Glyn. Lecturer in International Studies at the University College Northampton. Conversations with Žižek. 14-19

For Žižek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today's global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture - with all its pieties concerning 'multiculturalist' etiquette - Žižek is arguing for a politics that might be called 'radically incorrect' in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today's social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the trascendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Žižek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with the economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any retrograde return to economism. Žižek's point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular, we should not overlook Marx's central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose 'universalism' fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world's population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded 'life-chances' cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the developing world). And Žižek's point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism's profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity; to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency of today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Žižek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Žižek's universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a 'glitch' in an otherwise sound matrix. The response of the left to global capitalism cannot be one of retreat into the nation-state or into organicist forms of community’ and popular identities that currently abound in Europe and elsewhere. For Žižek it is, rather, a question of working with the very excesses that, in a Lacanian sense, are in capitalism more than capitalism. It is a question, therefore, of transcending the provincial ‘universalism’ of capitalism. To illustrate the point, Žižek draws attention to the category of ‘intellectual property’ and the increasingly absurd attempts to establish restrictive dominion over technological advance – genetic codes, DNA structures, digital communications, pharmaceutical breakthroughs, computer programs and so on – that either affect us all and/or to which there is a sense of common human entitlement. Indeed, the modern conjuncture of capitalism is more and more characterized by a prohibitive culture: the widespread repression of those forms of research and development that have real emancipatory potential beyond exclusive profiteering; the restriction of information that has direct consequences for the future of humanity; the fundamental denial that social equality could be sustained by the abundance generated by capitalism. Capitalism typically endeavours to constrain the very dimensions of the universal that are enabled by it and simultaneously to resist all those developments that disclose its specificity-artificially as merely one possible mode of being. The left, therefore, must seek to subvert these ungovernable excesses in the direction of a political and politicizing universalism; or what Balibar would call égaliberté. This means that the left should demand more globalization not less. Where neo-liberals speak the language of freedom – either in terms of individual liberty or the free movement of goods and capital – the left should use this language to combat today’s racist obsessions with ‘economic refugees’, ‘immigrants’ and so on, and insist that freedoms are meaningless without the social resources to participate in those freedoms. Where there is talk of universal rights, the left must affirm a responsibility to the universal, one that emphasizes real human solidarity and does not lose sight of the abject within differential discourses. Reversing the well-known environmentalists’ slogan, we must say that the left has to involve itself in thinking locally and acting globally. That is to say, it should attend to the specificity of today’s political identities within the context of their global (capitalist) conditions of possibility precisely in order to challenge those conditions. Yet here I would venture that, despite clearly stated differences (Butler et al., 2000), the political perspective of Žižek is not necessarily opposed to that of Laclau and Mouffe and that a combined approach is fully possible. While Žižek is right to stress the susceptibility of today’s ‘alternative’ forms of hegemonic engagement to deradicalization within a postmodern-p.c. imaginary – a kind of hegemonization of the very terrain (the politico-cultural conditions of possibility) that produces and predisposes the contemporary logics of hegemony – it is equally true to say that the type of political challenge that Žižek has in mind is one that can only advance through the type of hegemonic subversion that Laclau and Mouffe have consistently stressed in their work. The very possibility of a political universalism is one that depends on a certain hegemonic breaking out of the existing conventions/grammar of hegemonic engagement. It is along these lines that Žižek affirms the need for a more radical intervention in the political imagination. The modern (Machiavellian) view of politics is presented in terms of a basic tension between (potentially) unlimited demands/appetites and limited resources; a view which is implicit in the predominant ‘risk society’ perspective where the central (almost Habermasian) concern is with more and better scientific information. The political truth of today’s world, however, is the opposite of this view. That is to say, the demands of the official left (especially the various incarnations of the Third Way left) tend to articulate extremely modest demands in the face of a virtually unlimited capitalism that is more than capable of providing every person on this planet with a civilized standard of living. For Žižek, a confrontation with the obscenities of abundance capitalism also requires a transformation of the ethico-political imagination. It is no longer a question of developing ethical guidelines within the existing political framework (the various institutional and corporate ‘ethical committees’) but of developing a politicization of ethics; an ethics of the Real.8 The starting point here is an insistence on the unconditional autonomy of the subject; of accepting that as human beings we are ultimately responsible for our actions and being-in-the-world up to and including the constructions of the capitalist system itself. Far from simple norm-breaking or refining/reinforcing existing social protocol, an ethics of the Real tends to emerge through norm-breaking and in finding new directions that, by definition, involve traumatic changes: i.e. the Real in genuine ethical challenge. An ethics of the Real does not simply defer to the impossible (or infinite Otherness) as an unsurpassable horizon that already marks every act as a failure, incomplete and so on. Rather, such an ethics is one that fully accepts contingency but which is nonetheless prepared to risk the impossible in the sense of breaking out of standardized positions. We might say that it is an ethics which is not only politically motivated but which also draws its strength from the political itself. For Žižek an ethics of the Real (or Real ethics) means that we cannot rely on any form of symbolic Other that would endorse our (in)decisions and (in)actions: for example, the ‘neutral’ financial data of the stockmarkets; the expert knowledge of Beck’s ‘new modernity’ scientists, the economic and military councils of the New World Order; the various (formal and informal) tribunals of political correctness; or any of the mysterious laws of God, nature or the market. What Žižek affirms is a radical culture of ethical identification for the left in which the alternative forms of militancy must first of all be militant with themselves. That is to say, they must be militant in the fundamental ethical sense of not relying on any external/higher authority and in the de velopment of a political imagination that, like Žižek’s own thought, exhorts us to risk the impossible.

### Impact – Militarism

#### **Capitalism causes militarism – corporate profit incentivizes inflated defense spending and buildup of the military industrial complex – necessitates endless warmongering.**

Seymour 14 (Richard Seymour, The Guardian, PhD candidate at the

London School of Economics, Sociology department, “Global military spending is now an integral part of capitalism”, 3/7/14, http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2014/03/07/global-military-spending-is-now-an-integral-part-of-capitalism/)

China’s surge in military spending gains headlines, partly because of the ominous implications regarding its regional contest with Japan, but it’s the deeper structures of military spending in general that are far more compelling.¶ There are few surprises about the distribution of military spending: for all the current focus on China’s growing military outlays – and it is significant that they have embarked on a sequence of double-digit increases as a percentage of GDP – the United States still accounts for 40% of such expenditures. However, the distribution is not the only thing that matters; it’s the sheer scale of such investment – $1.756tn in 2012. The “peace dividend” from the end of the cold war has long since bitten the dust. Global military spending has returned to pre-1989 levels, undoubtedly a legacy of the war on terror and the returning salience of military competition in its context. In fact, by 2011 global military spending was higher than at any year since the end of the second world war.¶ So, what is the explanation for such huge investments? Is it simply the case that states are power-maximising entities, and that as soon as they have access to enough taxable income they start dreaming war?¶ In a very general sense, militarisation could be seen as an integral aspect of capitalism. One of the central ambiguities of capitalism is that it is necessarily a global system, with production and exchange extending beyond national boundaries; yet at the same time, units of capital (corporations etc) tend to be concentrated within national states where they are afforded an infrastructure, a labour force, and a great deal of primary investments. Even the process of globalisation presupposes the investment and guidance of national states. The more deeply companies are intertwined with national states, the more they rely on those states to fight their competitive battles on a global stage. Maintaining a military advantage is arguably an intrinsic part of this.¶ However, once this rather abstract principle is established, the question still remains unanswered. After all, there is no inherent reason why geo-economic competition should lead to defence spending consuming trillions of dollars of value each year. Part of the answer has to be located in the way that high levels of military spending became such an entrenched part of the global landscape in the aftermath of two world wars.¶ In the context of the second world war, and then in the subsequent cold war, one thing about military spending that became abundantly clear is that it is never just about conflict. As in the conduct of wars themselves, the institutionalisation of military spending quickly becomes entangled in a series of incentives that are entirely tangential to the ostensive motive.¶ First of all, states that do embark on large scale military investment quickly assume strategic command of core sectors of the economy, allowing for a degree of planning and co-ordination, a level of state capacity that might otherwise be deplored by business as “socialism”. Quite a lot of the major US technological advances made under the rubric of “free enterprise”, including particularly Apple’s innovations, owe themselves originally to state investments organised under the banner of “defence”.¶ Second, military investment is not just an effect of economic growth, but often a lever in enhancing it. This is a complicated story in itself. Post-war US growth was probably enhanced by arms spending, but the levels of spending required during the Vietnam war sapped too much capital away from other profitable investments. By the same token, it is not clear whether Japan’s rise to becoming a major global economic power would have been possible had its military commitments not been constitutionally limited.¶ Nonetheless, there is some complex evidence of arms spending increasing growth. Barry Rundquist and Thomas Carsey’s study of military procurement in the United States demonstrates that this has a distributive aspect. Such spending in the US helps already wealthy, booming locales become even wealthier, but it does not tend to make poor areas wealthier and nor does it reduce unemployment. This is quite significant, because one of the major arguments governments offer for protecting military spending is that it protects jobs – the one situation in which governments almost always feign an interest in employment. There is actually little evidence for this claim.¶ That brings us to a final point. There is no way to discuss the real dimensions of military competition without looking at how this is represented for particular audiences. One thinks of the way in which struggles over arms spending in the US become inflected with evocations of external threats, which help consolidate domestic power blocs. The Reaganite-era neo-conservative bloc was impossible without an elevated Russian “threat”. So, particularly in states with an imperialist role, military spending can become complexly bound up not only with state-building strategies and agendas for regional economic growth, but also with domestic hegemonic strategies in which the legitimacy of governments hinges upon their ability to project violence.¶ To this extent, to really understand world arms spending it is necessary to penetrate beneath the generalities about sui generis state behaviour, as power-maximisers and so on, and delve into the messy politics of militarism in each society.

### Impact – Environment

#### Capitalism is the root cause of all environmental destruction and is a necessary component of the drive for profits.

Foster 2(John Bellamy foster, Professor of Sociology at University of Oregon, II. Capitalism and ecology: the nature of the contradiction, June 15, 2002)

Today ecological crisis looms larger in our vision of anticapitalist revolt--to a degree that Marx did not and could not perceive. But our overall vision of the ecological features of a socialist revolution is scarcely more radical than what Marx himself envisioned, with his idea of the dissolution of the antagonistic relation of town and country and an attempt to overcome the metabolic rift through sustainable production based on a communal society of freely associated producers. When William Morris developed his ideas for the reorganization of relations between town and country in News from Nowhere he was knowingly or unknowingly very close to the spirit of Marx. We have no more reason today than Marx did in his day to restrict our analysis of ecological contradictions to what can be incorporated into some specific theory of economic crisis. Economic crisis theory can be overemphasized, even fetishized. Let me give you an example of this. For many years Marxist political economists of various persuasions have engaged in elaborate attempts to explain the imperialistic tendencies of capitalism--that is, the drive of the center of the system to exploit the periphery--by pointing to various specific theories of economic crisis. The problem of all such perspectives, in my view, is that they miss the point: imperialism is not the product of this or that economic crisis (nor does its significance lie in how it in turn bears on economic crisis phenomena), rather it is just as basic to the system, as it has historically evolved, as the search for profits itself. In other words, imperialism is a necessary product of capitalism as a globalizing force, and to the extent that Marx himself dealt with imperialism it was of course mainly in this sense. Economic crisis can complicate things in certain instances. But attempts to see the whole reality of imperialism through the prism of economic crisis only obscures its essential nature. In the case of ecological degradation we are dealing with a first order, not a second order, problem of capitalism (and not just of capitalism). Ecological degradation, like imperialism, is as basic to capitalism as the pursuit of profits itself (which depend to a large extent upon it). Nor should the environmental problem be seen largely through the economic prism in the sense that it derives its significance from the extent to which it generates economic crisis for capitalism.

#### Capitalism views the oceans as a dumping site --- ensures system environmental destruction.

Foster 1 (John Bellamy Foster, Professor of Sociology at University of Oregon, Ecology Against Capitalism, October 2001, <http://monthlyreview.org/1001jbf.htm>)

Research ideas currently receiving government and corporate funding, discussed in Discover magazine (August 2001), involve the search for something on the order of a “giant absorbent strip, coated with any of the many chemicals that react with carbon dioxide, that could pull the gas from the air as it passes by,” coupled with fleets of ships pulling two–mile–long pipes that will pump chilled, pressurized carbon dioxide deep into the oceans. In other words, proposals are under consideration that involve a scale of operation that might well dwarf the star wars defense system, both in magnitude and sheer folly. All of them raise major environmental considerations of their own. The fact that such research is being funded and given serious consideration demonstrates that, for the advanced capitalist economies, emission reductions as a solution to global warming are much less desirable than sci–fi technological solutions that will allow us simply to reroute such waste. The solution being proposed via sequestration technology is to dump the excess carbon dioxide **elsewhere—in the oceans instead of the atmosphere.** **The use of the ocean as the final destination for the wastes of the human economy was an** issue that already concerned Rachel Carson in the 1950s and ‘60s. From any rational perspective, greenhouse gas emission reductions on a level far more aggressive than what was envisioned by the Kyoto Protocol are now needed to address global warming. The IPCC Working Group I concluded in its 2001 report that “there is new and strong evidence that most of the warming observed over the last fifty years is attributable to human activities.” In place of the IPCC’s earlier estimate of an increase in temperature by 1.0–3.5 °C (1.8–6.3 °F) in this century, they now estimate an increase of 1.5–6.0 °C (2.7–10.8 °F). If this increase (even in the middle range) comes true, the earth’s environment will be so radically changed that cataclysmic results will undoubtedly manifest themselves worldwide. These will surely include increased desertification in arid regions and heavier rainfall and risks of floods in other regions; serious damage to crops in the tropics and eventually in temperate areas as well; rising sea levels (due to the melting of glaciers) that will submerge islands and delta regions; damage to ecosystems; and loss of both species and genetic diversity. On top of all of this, there will be increased risks to human health. As always the most exploited areas of the world and their inhabitants will prove most vulnerable. Yet, no matter how urgent it is for life on the planet as a whole that greenhouse gas buildup in the atmosphere be stopped, the failure of the Kyoto Protocol significantly to address this problem suggests that capitalism is unable to reverse course—that is, to move from a structure of industry and accumulation that has proven to be in the long run (and in many respects in the short run as well) environmentally disastrous. **When set against the get–rich–quick imperatives of capital accumulation, the biosphere scarcely weighs in the balance. The emphasis on profits to be obtained from fossil fuel consumption and from a form of development geared to the auto–industrial complex largely overrides longer–term issues associated with global warming—even if this threatens, within just a few generations, the planet itself.**

#### Capitalism causes extinction via unsustainable exploitation of nature

Foster 11(John B, “Capitalism and Degrowth-An Impossibility Theorem”, *Monthly Review Vol. 62, Iss. 8; pg. 26, 8 pgs ,* January 2011, proquest)

In the opening paragraph to his 2009 book, Storms of My Grandchildren, James Hansen, the world's foremost scientific authority on global warming, declared: "**Planet Earth**, creation, the world in which civilization developed, the world with climate patterns that we know and stable shorelines**, is in** imminent **peril** . . . .The startling conclusion is that continued **exploitation of all fossil fuels on Earth threatens not only the other millions of species on the planet but also the survival of humanity** itself - and the timetable is shorter than we thought."1 In making this declaration, however, Hansen was only speaking of a part of the global environmental crisis currently threatening the planet, namely, climate change. Recently, leading scientists (including Hansen) have proposed nine planetary boundaries, which mark the safe operating space for the planet. Three of these boundaries (climate change, biodiversity, and the nitrogen cycle) have already been crossed, while others, such as fresh water use and ocean accidification, are emerging planetary rifts. In ecological terms, the economy has now grown to a scale and intrusiveness that is both overshooting planetary boundaries and tearing apart the biogeochemical cycles of the planet.2 Hence, almost four decades after the Club of Rome raised the issue of "the limits to growth," the economic growth idol of modern society is once again facing a formidable challenge.3 What is known as "degrowth economics," associated with the work of Serge Latouche in particular, emerged as a major European intellectual movement in 2008 with the historic conference in Paris on "Economic De-Growth for Ecological Sustainability and Social Equity," and has since inspired a revival of radical Green thought, as epitomized by the 2010 "Degrowth Declaration" in Barcelona. Ironically, the meteoric rise of degrowth (décroissance in French) as a concept has coincided over the last three years with the reappearance of economic crisis and stagnation on a scale not seen since the 1930s. The degrowth concept therefore forces us to confront the questions: Is degrowth feasible in a capitalist grow-or-die society - and if not, what does this say about the transition to a new society? According to the Web site of the European degrowth project, "degrowth carries the idea of a voluntary reduction of the size of the economic system which implies a reduction of the GDP."4 "Voluntary" here points to the emphasis on voluntaristic solutions - though not as individualistic and unplanned in the European conception as the "voluntary simplicity" movement in the United States, where individuals (usually well-to-do) simply choose to opt out of the high-consumption market model. For Latouche, the concept of "**degrowth" signifies a major social change: a radical shift from growth as the main objective of the modern economy, toward** its opposite (**contraction**, downshifting). **An underlying premise of this** movement **is** that, in the face of **a planetary ecological emergency**, the promise of **green technology has proven fals**e. This can be attributed to the Jevons Paradox, according to which greater **efficiency in the use of energy and resources leads not to conservation but to greater economic growth, and** hence **more pressure** **on the environment**.5 The unavoidable conclusion - associated with a wide variety of political-economic and environmental thinkers, not just those connected directly to the European degrowth project - is that there needs to be a drastic alteration in the economic trends operative since the Industrial Revolution. As Marxist economist Paul Sweezy put it more than two decades ago: "Since **there is no way to increase the capacity of the environment to bear the [ burdens placed on it, it follows that the adjustment must come entirely from the other side of the equation. And since the disequilibrium has already reached dangerous proportions, it also follows that what is essential for success is a reversal, not merely a slowing down**, of the underlying trends of the last few centuries."6 Given that wealthy countries are already characterized by ecological overshoot, it is becoming more and more apparent that there is indeed no alternative, as Sweezy emphasized, but a reversal in the demands placed on the environment by the economy. This is consistent with the argument of ecological economist Herman Daly, who has long insisted on the need for a steady-state economy. Daly traces this perspective to John Stuart Mill's famous discussion of the "stationary state" in his Principles of Political Economy, which argued that if economic expansion was to level off (as the classical economists expected), the economic goal of society could then shift to the qualitative aspects of existence, rather than mere quantitative expansion. A century after Mill, Lewis Mumford insisted in his Condition of Man, first published in 1944, that not only was a stationary state in Mill's sense ecologically necessary, but that it should also be linked to a concept of "basic communism . . . [that] applies to the whole community the standards of the household," distributing "benefits according to need" (a view that drew upon Marx). Today this recognition of the need to bring economic growth in overdeveloped economies to a halt, and even to shrink these economies, is seen as rooted theoretically in Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen's The Entropy Law and the Economic Process, which established the basis of modern ecological economics.7 Degrowth as such is not viewed, even by its proponents, as a stable solution, but one aimed at reducing the size of the economy to a level of output that can be maintained perpetually at a steady-state. This might mean shrinking the rich economies by as much as a third from today's levels by a process that would amount to negative investment (since not only would new net investment cease but also only some, not all, worn-out capital stock would be replaced). A steady-state economy, in contrast, would carry out replacement investment but would stop short of new net investment. As Daly defines it, "a steady-state economy" is "an economy with constant stocks of people and artifacts, maintained at some desired, sufficient levels by low rates of maintenance 'throughput,' that is, by the lowest feasible flows of matter and energy."8 Needless to say, none of this would come easily, given today's capitalist economy. In particular, Latouche's work, which can be viewed as exemplary of the European degrowth project, is beset with contradictions, resulting not from the concept of degrowth perse, but from his attempt to skirt the question of capitalism. This can be seen in his 2006 article, "The Globe Downshifted," where he argues in convoluted form: For some on the far left, the stock answer is that capitalism is the problem, leaving us stuck in a rut and powerless to move towards a better society. Is economic contraction compatible with capitalism? This is a key question, but one that it is important to answer without resort to dogma, if the real obstacles are to be understood .... **Eco-compatible capitalism** is conceivable in theory, but **unrealistic in practice.** Capitalism would require a high level of regulation to bring about the reduction of our ecological footprint**. The market system, dominated by huge multinational corporations, will never set off down the virtuous path of eco-capitalism of its own accord .**... Mechanisms for countering power with power, as existed under the Keynes-Fordist regulations of the Social-Democratic era, are conceivable and desirable. But the class struggle seems to have broken down. The problem is: capital won .... A society based on economic contraction cannot exist under capitalism. But capitalism is a deceptively simple word for a long, complex history. Getting rid of the capitalists and banning wage labour, currency and private ownership of the means of production would plunge society into chaos. It would bring large-scale terrorism. . ..We need to find another way out of development, economism (a belief in the primacy of economic causes and factors) and growth: one that does not mean forsaking the social institutions that have been annexed by the economy (currency, markets, even wages) but reframes them according to different principles.9

### Cap Unsustainable

#### **Civilization is unsustainable without major reorientation of the economic system – statistical and empirical models prove resource use and inequality make collapse inevitable.**

Ahmed 14 (Nafeez Ahmed, executive director of the Institute for Policy Research & Development, The Guardian, “Nasa-funded study: industrial civilisation headed for 'irreversible collapse'?”, 3/14/14, http://www.theguardian.com/environment/earth-insight/2014/mar/14/nasa-civilisation-irreversible-collapse-study-scientists)

A new study sponsored by Nasa's Goddard Space Flight Center has highlighted the prospect that global industrial civilisation could collapse in coming decades due to unsustainable resource exploitation and increasingly unequal wealth distribution.¶ Noting that warnings of 'collapse' are often seen to be fringe or controversial, the study attempts to make sense of compelling historical data showing that "the process of rise-and-collapse is actually a recurrent cycle found throughout history." Cases of severe civilisational disruption due to "precipitous collapse - often lasting centuries - have been quite common."¶ The research project is based on a new cross-disciplinary 'Human And Nature DYnamical' (HANDY) model, led by applied mathematician Safa Motesharri of the US National Science Foundation-supported National Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center, in association with a team of natural and social scientists. The study based on the HANDY model has been accepted for publication in the peer-reviewed Elsevier journal, Ecological Economics.¶ It finds that according to the historical record even advanced, complex civilisations are susceptible to collapse, raising questions about the sustainability of modern civilisation:¶ "The fall of the Roman Empire, and the equally (if not more) advanced Han, Mauryan, and Gupta Empires, as well as so many advanced Mesopotamian Empires, are all testimony to the fact that advanced, sophisticated, complex, and creative civilizations can be both fragile and impermanent."¶ By investigating the human-nature dynamics of these past cases of collapse, the project identifies the most salient interrelated factors which explain civilisational decline, and which may help determine the risk of collapse today: namely, Population, Climate, Water, Agriculture, and Energy.¶ These factors can lead to collapse when they converge to generate two crucial social features: "the stretching of resources due to the strain placed on the ecological carrying capacity"; and "the economic stratification of society into Elites [rich] and Masses (or "Commoners") [poor]" These social phenomena have played "a central role in the character or in the process of the collapse," in all such cases over "the last five thousand years."¶ Currently, high levels of economic stratification are linked directly to overconsumption of resources, with "Elites" based largely in industrialised countries responsible for both:¶ "... accumulated surplus is not evenly distributed throughout society, but rather has been controlled by an elite. The mass of the population, while producing the wealth, is only allocated a small portion of it by elites, usually at or just above subsistence levels."¶ The study challenges those who argue that technology will resolve these challenges by increasing efficiency:¶ "Technological change can raise the efficiency of resource use, but it also tends to raise both per capita resource consumption and the scale of resource extraction, so that, absent policy effects, the increases in consumption often compensate for the increased efficiency of resource use."¶ Productivity increases in agriculture and industry over the last two centuries has come from "increased (rather than decreased) resource throughput," despite dramatic efficiency gains over the same period.¶ Modelling a range of different scenarios, Motesharri and his colleagues conclude that under conditions "closely reflecting the reality of the world today... we find that collapse is difficult to avoid." In the first of these scenarios, civilisation:¶ ".... appears to be on a sustainable path for quite a long time, but even using an optimal depletion rate and starting with a very small number of Elites, the Elites eventually consume too much, resulting in a famine among Commoners that eventually causes the collapse of society. It is important to note that this Type-L collapse is due to an inequality-induced famine that causes a loss of workers, rather than a collapse of Nature."¶ Another scenario focuses on the role of continued resource exploitation, finding that "with a larger depletion rate, the decline of the Commoners occurs faster, while the Elites are still thriving, but eventually the Commoners collapse completely, followed by the Elites."¶ In both scenarios, Elite wealth monopolies mean that they are buffered from the most "detrimental effects of the environmental collapse until much later than the Commoners", allowing them to "continue 'business as usual' despite the impending catastrophe." The same mechanism, they argue, could explain how "historical collapses were allowed to occur by elites who appear to be oblivious to the catastrophic trajectory (most clearly apparent in the Roman and Mayan cases)."¶ Applying this lesson to our contemporary predicament, the study warns that:¶ "While some members of society might raise the alarm that the system is moving towards an impending collapse and therefore advocate structural changes to society in order to avoid it, Elites and their supporters, who opposed making these changes, could point to the long sustainable trajectory 'so far' in support of doing nothing."

### AT: Permutation

#### The permutation fails – resistance to capitalism must be totalizing, or the system will only regenerate itself stronger from the pieces left standing under the guise of reform.

Kovel 2 (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard, The Enemy of Nature, p 142-3)

The value-term that subsumes everything into the spell of capital sets going a kind of wheel of accumulation, from production to consumption and back, spinning ever more rapidly as the inertial mass of capital grows, and generating its force field as a spinning magnet generates an electrical field. This phenomenon has important implications for the reformability of the system. Because capital is so spectral, and succeeds so well in ideologically mystifying its real nature, attention is constantly deflected from the actual source of eco-destabilization to the instruments by which that source acts. The real problem, however, is the whole mass of globally accumulated capital, along with the speed of its circulation and the class structures sustaining this. That is what generates the force field, in proportion to its own scale; and it is this force field, acting across the numberless points of insertion that constitute the ecosphere, that creates ever larger agglomerations of capital, sets the ecological crisis going, and keeps it from being resolved. For one fact may be taken as certain — that to resolve the ecological crisis as a whole, as against tidying up one corner or another, is radically incompatible with the existence of gigantic pools of capital, the force field these induce, the criminal underworld with which they connect, and, by extension, the elites who comprise the transnational bourgeoisie. And by not resolving the crisis as a whole, we open ourselves to the spectre of another mythical creature, the many-headed hydra, that regenerated itself the more its individual tentacles were chopped away. To realize this is to recognize that there is no compromising with capital, no schema of reformism that will clean up its act by making it act more greenly or efficiently We shall explore the practical implications of this thesis in Part III, and here need simply to restate the conclusion in blunt terms: green capital, or non-polluting capital, is preferable to the immediately ecodestructive breed on its immediate terms. But this is the lesser point, and diminishes with its very success. For green capital (or ‘socially/ecologically responsible investing’) exists, by its very capital-nature, essentially to create more value, and this leaches away from the concretely green location to join the great pool, and follows its force field into zones of greater concentration, expanded profitability — and greater ecodestruction.

#### Alt comes first—doing nothing allows us to break with the status quo strategy of intervening without change, and instead create new possibilities for society.

Daly 7-[Glyn, Lecturer of Politics at Northampton University, “The Materialism of Spirit: Zizek and the Logics of the Political,” International Journal of Zizek Studies, 1(4), 2007, http://www.zizekstudies.org/index.php/ijzs/article/view/79/139, AD: 6-22-9]

In this sense our autonomy is at once more precarious and more radical. Today we are bombarded with all sorts of choices (consumption, lifestyles, customization of communication technologies etc.) that identify us as ‘free individuals’. Yet we also possess the capacity to refuse the field of choosing and freedom; to reject the very modality of making changes to our lives and to break with the terms and conditions that are implicit in the latter. Along the lines of the famous monologue from Trainspotting, we are in a position in which we can choose ‘not to choose life’. This involves the more radical ethical freedom of which Hegel speaks and of assuming a certain position of ‘being impossible’ – i.e. of refusing the terms of identitarian inscription. It is in this context that we can make sense of Žižek’s reference to the Melville character, Bartleby, and his ‘I would prefer not to’. Thus what is being is affirmed is a strategic form of non-intervention and a refusal to participate in whatŽižek calls the ‘rumspringaof resistance’: that is, ‘all the forms of resisting which help the system to reproduce itself by ensuring our participation in it’ (Žižek, 2006: 381-385). The problem is not so much direct participation in the system but rather the implicit forms of participation in the hegemonic practices and rituals that are expected of contemporary liberal-left resistance: it is this type of resistance that needs to be resisted. So what needs to be developed is a kind of aggressive-passivity along the lines of ‘”I would prefer not to give to charity to support a Black orphan in Africa, engage in the struggle to prevent oil- drilling in a wildlife swamp, send books to educate our liberal-feminist-spirited women in Afghanistan”’ (Žižek, 2006: 383). And here I think that Stavrakakis misses his target when he criticises Žižek for arguing the case for inaction in the face of global-liberal-capitalism’s injunction that nothing should happen: ‘(s)urely “to do nothing” does not make sense as a remedy against those who supposedly argue that “nothing should happen”’ (Stavrakakis, 2007: 133). The ‘contradiction’ identified by Stavrakakis needs to read in terms of the discourse of the obsessive-neurotic who engages in all in kinds of frantic activity(filling up the gaps/silences) precisely in order that nothing Real should happen. So what we have is rather a paradoxwherein the possibility of genuine transformation is repressed through hyperactivity. Žižek’s point therefore is that ‘we’(i.e. the Left) should not participate in the terms of today’s dominant ethos of obsessive-neurosis and its hyperactive culture of political inaction.To avoid misunderstanding, the argument is not that we are obliged to choose between choosing and not-choosing or between capitulation and full scale assault on the existing mode of choosing. There is more ambiguity than may appear at first sight. A particular choice may be ‘officially’ permitted and yet implicitly prohibited (e.g. the declaration of atheism in American public life) and thus the making of that choice ‘within’ an existing modality may very well have the effect of undermining the modal logic. Equally, refusing to engage in making decisions or, what amounts to the same thing, making ‘impossible demands’ without any real substance can very quickly evoke a beautiful-soul-syndrome and an intrinsic passivity/inaction in the face of existing states of affairs. As Marx is reported to have said, insurrection is an art (cited in Trotsky, 1977). By this I take to mean that insurrection is a process of subversion that also undermines the existing logics of subversion as a way of forging new (utopic) spaces of political invention and creativity. It is in this context that Badiou’s idea of a politics of subtraction becomes important: i.e. a process of strategic withdrawal in such a way that it destroys not only the symbolic edifice but its very architectural logic as well. Of central importance is the attitude adopted towards the liberal democratic imagination. Radical democracy is something that strives to deepen and sharpen the latter (against capitalist and repressive logics etc.). But from this perspective the task of the Left cannot be to simply embrace this imagination as if it were a de facto end of history containing infinite potentiality. A Left politics of subtraction would mean above all standing with the symptomal truths of our age and recognising the way in which its multiculturalism and infra-political engagement are already implicated in, fractalized as part of, the totality of cosmopolitan capitalism and its deliquescence over such issues as global poverty and hunger.

### AT: Reformism

#### Single-issue movements and reforms of the state can’t make a dent in capitalism.

Herod 7(James, Columbia U graduate and political activist, 2007, “Getting Free” Pg. 30)

**We cannot destroy capitalism with single-issue campaigns**, yet the great bulk of radicals’ energy is spent on these campaigns. There are dozens of them: campaigns to defend abortion rights, maintain rent control, halt whaling, prohibit toxic dumping, stop the war on drugs, stop police brutality, stop union busting, abolish the death penalty, stop the logging of redwoods, outlaw the baby seal kill, ban genetically modified foods, stop the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, stop global warming, and on and on. **What we are doing is spending our lives trying to fix a system that generates evils faster than we can ever eradicate them. Although some of these campaigns use direct action** (e.g., spikes in the trees to stop the chain saws or Greenpeace boats in front of the whaling ships to block the harpoons), **for the most part the campaigns are aimed at passing legislation in Congress to correct the problem**. Unfortunately, **reforms that are won in one decade**, after endless agitation, **can be easily wiped off the books the following decade**, after the protesters have gone home or a new administration comes to power. These struggles all have value and are needed. Could anyone think that the campaigns against global warming, to free Leonard Peltier, or to aid the East Timorese ought to be abandoned? **Single-issue campaigns keep us aware of what's wrong and sometimes even win gains. But in and of themselves, they cannot destroy capitalism, and thus cannot really fix things. It is utopian to believe that we can reform capitalism. Most of these evils can only be eradicated for good if we destroy capitalism itself and create a new civilization. We cannot afford to aim for anything less. Our very survival is at stake**. There is one single-issue campaign I can wholeheartedly endorse: the total and permanent eradication of capitalism.

### AT: No Alternative

#### There is only no alternative if we think under capitalism and accept it – this mindset locks us into the inevitability of capitalism’s destructive tendencies.

Meszaros 7 (Istvan, Prof Emeritus of Philosophy @ U of Sussex, “The Only Viable Economy” The Monthly Review Vol. 58.11 April)

It is not at all accidental or surprising that the proposition of “there is no alternative” occupies such a prominent place in the socioeconomic and political conceptions formulated from capital’s standpoint. Not even the greatest thinkers of the bourgeoisie—like Adam Smith and Hegel—could be exceptions in this respect. For it is absolutely true that the bourgeois order either succeeds in asserting itself in the form of dynamic capital expansion, or it is condemned to ultimate failure. There can be really no conceivable alternative to endless capital expansion from capital’s standpoint, determining thereby the vision of all those who adopt it. But the adoption of this standpoint also means that the question of “what price must be paid” for uncontrollable capital expansion beyond a certain point in time—once the ascendant phase of the system’s development is left behind—cannot enter into consideration at all. The violation of historical time is therefore the necessary consequence of adopting capital’s standpoint by internalizing the system’s expansionary imperative as its most fundamental and absolutely unalterable determinant. Even in the conceptions of the greatest bourgeois thinkers this position must prevail. There can be no alternative future social order whose defining characteristics would be significantly different from the already established one. This is why even Hegel, who formulated by far the most profound historical conception up to his own time, must also arbitrarily bring history to an end in capital’s unalterable present, idealizing the capitalist nation state11 as the insuperable climax of all conceivable historical development, despite his sharp perception of the destructive implications of the whole system of nation states. Thus, there can be no alternative to decreeing the pernicious dogma of no alternative in bourgeois thought. But it is totally absurd for socialists to adopt the position of endless (and by its nature uncontrollable) capital expansion. For the corollary idealization of—again characteristically unqualified—“consumption” ignores the elementary truth that from capital’s uncritical self-expansionary vantage point there can be no difference between destruction and consumption. One is as good as the other for the required purpose. This is so because the commercial transaction in the capital relation—even of the most destructive kind, embodied in the ware of the military/industrial complex and the use to which it is put in its inhuman wars—successfully completes the cycle of capital’s enlarged self-reproduction, so as to be able to open a new cycle. This is the only thing that really matters to capital, no matter how unsustainable might be the consequences. Consequently, **when socialists internalize the imperative of capital expansion as the necessary ground of the advocated growth, they do not simply accept an isolated tenet but a whole “package deal.” Knowingly or not, they accept at the same time all of the false alternatives—like “growth or no-growth”—that can be derived from the uncritical advocacy of necessary capital expansion. The false alternative of no growth must be rejected by us not only because its adoption would perpetuate the most gruesome misery and inequality now dominating the world, with struggle and destructiveness inseparable from it. The radical negation of that approach can only be a necessary point of departure. The inherently positive dimension of our vision involves the fundamental redefinition of wealth itself as known to us. Under capital’s social metabolic order we are confronted by the alienating rule of wealth over society, directly affecting every aspect of life, from the narrowly economic to the cultural and spiritual domains. Consequently, we cannot get out of capital’s vicious circle, with all of its ultimately destructive determinations and false alternatives, without fully turning around that vital relationship. Namely, without making society—the society of freely associated individuals—rule over wealth, redefining at the same time also their relation to time and to the kind of use to which the products of human labor are put. As Marx had written already in one of his early works:**

### AT: Transition Wars

#### The crackdown won’t happen – capital can’t afford to attack its labor.

Meszaros 95 (Istvan, Prof @ U of Sussex, Beyond Capital P 725-727)

**Another argument** which is often **used in favour of permanent accommodation is the threat of extreme authoritarian measures that must be faced by a socialist revolutionary movemen**t. This argument is backed up by emphasizing both the immense destructive power at capital's disposal and the undeniable historical fact that no ruling order ever cedes willingly its position of command over society, using if need be even the most violent form of repression to retain its rule. The weakness of this argument is twofold, despite the factual circumstances which would seem to support it. First**, it disregards that the antagonistic confrontation between capital and labour is not a political/military one in which one of the antagonists could be slaughtered on the battlefield or riveted to chains. Inasmuch as there can be chains in this confrontation, labour is wearing them already,** in that the only type of chains compatible with **the system must be 'flexible' enough to enable the class of labour to produce and be exploited**. Nor can one imagine that the authoritarian might of capital is likely to be used only against a revolutionary socialist movement. The repressive anti-labour measures of the last two decades — not to mention many instances of past historical emergency characterized by the use of violence under the capital system —give a foretaste of worse things to come in the event of extreme confrontations. But this is not a matter of either/or, with some sort of apriori guarantee of a 'fair' and benevolent treatment in the event of labour's willing accommodation and submission. The matter hinges on the gravity of the crisis and on the circumstances under which the antagonistic confrontations unfold. Uncomfortable as this truth may sound to socialists, **one of the heaviest chains which labour has to wear today is that it is tied to capital for its continued survival, for as long as it does not succeed in making a strategic break in the direction of a transition to a radically different social metabolic order. But that is even more true of capital, with the qualitative difference that capital cannot make any break towards the establishment of a different social order. For capital, truly, 'there is no alternative' — and there can never be — to its exploitative structural dependency on labour.** If nothing else, **this fact sets well marked limits to capital's ability to permanently subdue labour by violence, compelling it to use**, instead, **the earlier mentioned 'flexible chains' against the class of labour. It can use violence with success selectively, against limited groups of labour, but not against the socialist movement organized as a revolutionary mass movement.**

### AT: Hunger

#### Trade liberalization causes famine – using capitalism to solve it is impossible.

**GRAIN 96** , “Free Trade Versus Food Security”, Seedling, October 21, 1996, http://www.grain.org/article/entries/322-free-trade-versus-food-security

**In the South, the different elements of trade liberalisation often translate directly into food insecurity.** Among these elements the following have the most severe impacts on peoples livelihood. In addition they easily result in internal migration, urban growth and environmental destruction: \* **undoing land reform and allowing concentration of land ownership \* privatising water \* introducing monopoly control on seeds** through IPRs \* **diverting land from food to cash crops** for exports \* **diverting food from local to global markets Volatile prices and globalisation are creating an unstable, insecure and costly food system and undermin**e the ecological security of agriculture, the livelihood security of farmers **and the food security of both poor and affluent consumers**. "We in the South Asian subcontinent have more than the World Bank indices as our guide. We have our history", says Vandana Shiva. "**India's worst famines took place when India's economy was most integrated though** the **globalisation** of the colonial period."

### AT: Gibson-Graham

#### Gibson-Graham’s method surrenders to capitalism and allows the alt to become co-opted.

Poitevin 1 (Rene, sociology@NYU, Socialist Reivew, <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3952/is_200101/ai_n8932891/?tag=mantle_skin;content>, accessed: 30 June 2011)

I begin with the postmodern (mis)appropriation of Althusser's notion of "overdetermination," namely the intuition that reality is so complex that it is better understood as a multicausal process rather than as a "structural" or systemic mechanism, as in the traditional Marxist explanation of capitalism. Then, through a close reading of J.K. Gibson-Graham's (which is the professional name of scholars Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson), The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It),2 I show that despite its intuitive analytical appeal and theoretical sophistication, their book espouses an unconvincing and ultimately reactionary postmodern/post-Marxist politics - one that is ultimately predicated around how to make capitalism more user friendly. I will show that to practice or "perform" postmodern Marxist politics in our present situation is not to engage in what the Amherst School of postmodern Marxism describes as a "politics of opportunity and attainment,"3 but to practice the politics of surrender instead. I will make clear that what ultimately gives internal consistency to many of the critiques of postmodern and post-Marxist theorists is a profound distortion and co-optation of the most critical, unique, and politically mobilizing features of Marxist theory, on one hand, combined with a renaturalization of a capitalism predicated on liberal notions of social and economic reform, on the other.4

### AT: Framework

#### Role of the ballot is the team that best challenges capitalism – their framework forces out discussion and shields the system from critique.

Wollf 11 an American economist, well known for his work on Marxian economics, economic methodology, and class analysis, (Richard, 10/4, “Occupy Wall Street ends capitalism's alibi”, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/oct/04/occupy-wall-street-new-york>)

We all know that moving in this direction will elicit the screams of "socialism" from the usual predictable corners. The tired rhetoric lives on long after the cold war that orchestrated it fades out of memory. The audience for that rhetoric is fast fading, too. It is long overdue in the US for us to have a genuine conversation and struggle over our current economic system. Capitalism has gotten a free pass for far too long.We take pride in questioning, challenging, criticising and debating our health, education, military, transportation and other basic social institutions. We argue whether their current structures and functioning serve our needs. We work our way to changing them so they perform better. And so it should be. Yet, for decades now, we have failed to similarly question, challenge, criticise and debate our economic system: capitalism. Because a taboo protected capitalism, cheerleading and celebrating it became obligatory. Criticism and questions got banished as heresy, disloyalty or worse. Behind the protective taboo, capitalism degenerated into the ineffective, unequal, crisis-ridden social disaster we all now bear.Capitalism is the problem – and the joblessness, homelessness, insecurity, and austerity it now imposes everywhere are the costs we bear. We have the people, the skills and the tools to produce the goods and services needed for a just society to prosper. We just need to reorganise our producing units differently, to go beyond a capitalist economic system that no longer serves our needs. Humanity learned to do without kings and emperors and slave masters. We found our way to a democratic alternative, however partial and unfinished the democratic project remains. We can now take the next step to realise that democratic project. We can bring democracy to our enterprises – by transforming them into cooperatives owned, operated and governed by democratic assemblies composed of all who work in them and all the residents of the communities who are interdependent with them. Let me conclude by offering a slogan: "The US can do better than corporate capitalism." Let that be an idea and a debate that this renewed movement can engage. Doing so would give an immense gift to the US and the world. It would break through the taboo, finally subjecting capitalism to the critiques and debates it has evaded for far too long – and at far too great a cost to all of us.

## Affirmative

### Permutation – Reformism

#### Only the permutation can achieve successful progress – pure ideological rejection of all state action only allows exploitation to continue.

Harvey 10 David, Professor of [Anthropology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthropology) at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, (The Enigma of Capital, and the crises of capitalism 224-228)

The co-revolutionary theory laid out earlier would suggest that there is no way that an anti -capitalist social order can be constructed without seizing state power, radically transforming it and reworking the constitutional and institutional framework that currently supports private property, the market system and endless capital accumulation. Inter-state competition and geoeconomic and geopolitical struggles over everything from trade and money to questions of hegemony are also either far too significant to be left to local social movements or cast aside as too big to contemplate. How the architecture of the state-finance nexus is to be reworked, along with the pressing question of the common measure of value given by money, cannot be ignored in the quest to construct alternatives to capitalist political economy. To ignore the state and the dynamics of the inter-state system is therefore a ridiculous idea for any anti-capitalist revolutionary movement to accept. The fourth broad trend is constituted by all the social movements that are not so much guided by any particular political philosophy or leanings but by the pragmatic need to resist displacement and dispossession (through gentrification, industrial development, dam construction, water privatisation, the dismantling of social services and public educational opportunities, or whatever). In this instance the focus on daily life in the city, town, village or wherever provides a material base for political organising against the threats that state policies and capitalist interests invariably pose to vulnerable populations. Again, there is a vast array of social movements of this sort, some of which can become radicalised over time as they come to realise more and more that the problems are systemic rather than particular and local. The bringing-together of such social movements into alliances on the land (like the landless movement in Brazil or peasants mobilising against land and resource grabs by capitalist corporations in India) or in urban contexts (the right to the city movements in Brazil and now the United States) suggest the way may be open to create broader alliances to discuss and confront the systemic forces that underpin the particularities of gentrification, dam construction, privatisation or whatever. Driven by pragmatism rather than by ideological preconceptions, these movements nevertheless can arrive at systemic understandings out of their own experience. To the degree that many of them exist in the same space, such as within the metropolis, they can (as supposedly happened with the factory workers in the early stages of the industrial revolution) make common cause and begin to forge, on the basis of their own experience, a consciousness of how capitalism works and what it is that might be done collectively. This is the terrain where the figure of the 'organic intellectual' leader, made so much of in the early twentieth -century Marxist writer Antonio Gramsd's work, the autodidact who comes to understand the world first hand through bitter experiences, but shapes his or her understanding of capitalism more generally, has a great deal to say. To listen to the peasant leaders of the MST in Brazil or the leaders of the anticorporate land grab movement in India is a privileged education. In this instance the task of the educated discontented is to magnify the subaltern voice so that attention can be paid to the circumstances of exploitation and repression and the answers that can be shaped into an anti-capitalist programme.

### Permutation – Inevitable

#### Capitalism is inevitable – only working within the system can prevent environmental destruction.

Wilson 2K (John K. Wilson, Institute for College Freedom, “How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People,” 2000, p. 15-16)

**Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism-they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God.** Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town-the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. **The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances**. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But **the right thrives on having an ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself.**

### Cap Good – Environment

#### **Cap is not the root cause of environmental destruction, it actually helps the environment.**

Payne 95

Rodger A. Payne. (Assistant professor of political science at the University of Louisville. He is director of the Grawemeyer Award in Ideas Improving World Order and a past recipient of a Social Science Research Council-MacArthur Foundation Fellowship in International Peace and Security.) “Freedom and the Environment”. National Endowment for Democracy and the Johns Hopkins University Press. <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/v006/6.3payne.html#authbio>.

5) Open markets. All democracies have had market-based economic systems; it therefore seems reasonable to consider any potential [End Page 48] advantages of markets when assessing the "green" characteristics of democracies. Such consideration seems particularly apposite when one recalls that many of the ardent environmentalist critics of democracy named earlier have cited its emphasis on private property and open markets as a grave shortcoming. In fact, however, capitalism is not the cause of environmental degradation. After all, nonmarket economies have exploited the environment quite ruthlessly, and mounting evidence indicates that some businesses in open economies are finding strong incentives to protect the environment. Additionally, democratic governments are increasingly utilizing market incentives to address ecological problems. The key question is how to account for the diffused environmental costs ("externalities") of economic activity. To begin with, green consumerism can reshape corporate conduct by offering incentives for environmentally sound business practices. An increasing number of consumers are "voting with their pocketbooks" and thereby successfully urging business to take responsibility for reducing waste and pollution. For example, McDonald's, responding in part to schoolchildren mailing styrofoam sandwich containers to its executives, revamped its product packaging and modified its "waste stream" in conjunction with recommendations offered by an environmental organization. Germany and other states have developed standardized labeling symbols so that consumers can identify and purchase products that are less harmful to the environment. Nonetheless, the future influence of green consumerism is at best unknown, and could be limited by a variety of informational complexities. [15](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/v006/6.3payne.html" \l "FOOT15) Much more importantly, the marketing of environmental goods and services is becoming a major industry, and some enterprises are seeing the economic advantages of reducing waste and increasing operational efficiency. Corporations can profit from selling preventive and cleanup technologies and information to other businesses. This is already a large and growing source of world trade. For instance, while West European nations, Japan, and the United States together traded about $20 billion worth of pollution-control devices in 1990, just two years later Germany alone was trading more than that amount. Domestic environmental transactions offer an even larger market. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) calculates that its member states individually spend between 0.8 and 1.5 percent of GDP on public and private pollution abatement and control. The overall total approached $250 billion in 1992, and could shoot up by half again by 1997.

#### Capitalism is the only way to protect the environment.

Boston Globe, 95

Thomas C Palmer Jr, staff writer. “Capitalism called key to saving environment” LexisNexis

What many activists perceive as the enemy of the environment - capitalism - is in fact the only form of government that can sustain it, political scientist James Q. Wilson said. "Capitalism is the necessary, but not sufficient, condition for environmental protection," Wilson said Friday night, accepting an award at the Gordon Public Policy Center at Brandeis University. "It is necessary because history has shown neither communism nor any other form of organized society can better protect air, water, land and life, he said. But it is insufficient because "it's hard to own a gray whale" or a scenic view, Wilson said. In the absence of ownership and the protective actions that go with it, "collective actions," or laws and regulations to protect elements of the environment, are necessary, he said. For 25 years a teacher at Harvard University and the author of "The Moral Sense," "Thinking About Crime" and many other books, Wilson decamped to his home state of California in 1990 and teaches at the University of California at Los Angeles. He joked that in this century several nations - like Korea, Vietnam and Germany - have "volunteered" to be cut in half, thus offering an experiment in which some forms of government perform better with respect to issues like the environment. Early environmentalists such as Barry Commoner and Rachel Carson blamed capitalism for environmental degradation, he said. "Then the Iron Curtain came down. We discovered a vast toxic waste dump." Capitalism works to protect the environment over the long run because it is a necessary condition for democracy, which allows individuals to act politically against those who would harm air or water quality, he said. Capitalism also brings relative prosperity, he said, allowing people to afford things other than basic necessities. "High-yield agriculture has led to one of the greatest reforestations in the history of man," Wilson said, referring to New England. Also, "it is easier to regulate a private firm than a government agency," he said, noting that Southern California Edison is always ahead of its publicly owned counterpart, Southern California Water and Power, in adopting new technologies. He attacked the press for scaring the public needlessly and for discouraging "policy entrepreneurs" who experiment with new solutions. Partly as a result of these exaggerations, Wilson said, "We cannot even carry on a debate . . . without grabbing each other's lapels, whitening our knuckles, and shouting in each other's faces."

### Cap Good – Ethics

#### Capitalism is ethical—provides means to better lives

**Saunders 7** – fellow, Center for Independent Studies (Peter, Why Capitalism is Good for the Soul, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders\_summer07.html)

What Clive Hamilton airily dismisses as a ‘growth fetish’ has resulted in one hour of work today delivering twenty-five times more value than it did in 1850. This has freed huge chunks of our time for leisure, art, sport, learning, and other ‘soul-enriching’ pursuits. Despite all the exaggerated talk of an ‘imbalance’ between work and family life, the average Australian today spends a much greater proportion of his or her lifetime free of work than they would had they belonged to any previous generation in history.  There is another sense, too, in which capitalism has freed individuals so they can pursue worthwhile lives, and that lies in its record of undermining tyrannies and dictatorships. As examples like Pinochet’s Chile and Putin’s Russia vividly demonstrate, a free economy does not guarantee a democratic polity or a society governed by the rule of law. But as Milton Friedman once pointed out, these latter conditions are never found in the absence of a free economy.(12) Historically, it was capitalism that delivered humanity from the ‘soul-destroying’ weight of feudalism. Later, it freed millions from the dead hand of totalitarian socialism. While capitalism may not be a sufficient condition of human freedom, it is almost certainly a necessary one.  [continues] Wherever populations have a chance to move, the flow is always towards capitalism, not away from it. The authorities never had a problem keeping West Germans out of East Germany, South Koreans out of North Korea, or Taiwanese out of Communist China. The attraction of living in a capitalist society is not just that the economy works. It is also that if your version of the good life leads you to turn your back on capitalism, you don’t have to pick up sticks and move away. If you don’t like capitalism, there is no need to bribe people-smugglers to get you out of the country. You simply buy a plot of land, build your mud-brick house, and drop out (or, like Clive, you set up your own think tank and sell books urging others to drop out).

### Cap Good – Growth

#### Economic growth and continued production are the only way to prevent extinction.

Zey 98 (Michael, Executive Director – Expansionary Institute, Professor of Management – Montclair State University, Seizing the Future, p. 34, 39-40)

However, no outside force guarantees the continued progress of the human species, nor does anything mandate that the human species must even continue to exist. In fact, history is littered with races and civilizations that have disappeared without a trace. So, too, could the human species. There is no guarantee that the human species will survive even if we posit, as many have, a special purpose to the species’ existence. Therefore, the species innately comprehends that it must engage in purposive actions in order to maintain its level of growth and progress. Humanity’s future is conditioned by what I call the Imperative of Growth, a principle I will herewith describe along with its several corollaries. The Imperative of Growth states that in order to survive, any nation, indeed, the human race, must grow, both materially and intellectually. The Macroindustrial Era represents growth in the areas of both technology and human development, a natural stage in the evolution of the species’ continued extension of its control over itself and its environment. Although 5 billion strong, our continued existence depends on our ability to continue the progress we have been making at higher and higher levels. Systems, whether organizations, societies, or cells, have three basic directions in which to move. They can grow, decline, or temporarily reside in a state of equilibrium. These are the choices. Choosing any alternative to growth, for instance, stabilization of production/consumption through zero-growth policies, could have alarmingly pernicious side effects, including extinction.The fifth corollary of the Imperative of Growth claims that a society can remain in a state of equilibrium only temporarily. In reality, a society seemingly in a phase where it neither improves nor regresses is actually in a transition to either growth or decline. Such periods easily seduce their contemporaries into a false sense of security, that their institutions will last forever, they have all the science they need, and there are no more challenges. In fact, during such periods some imagine that they have reached their “golden age,” perhaps even the “end of history.” During such periods of supposed equilibrium, the population ceases to prepare itself for new challenges and becomes risk averse. Importantly, they reject the idea that growth and progress are necessary for their survival. The sixth corollary evolves from the fifth. If the system chooses not to grow, it will decline and eventually disappear, either because other organisms or systems overtake it or because it is impossible to maintain itself even at static levels without in some way deteriorating. This is the Law of Spiraling Regression. It is indeed a curiosity of the late-twentieth-century culture that this truism has been ignored. In the morass of claims about the risks of technological growth and its impact on the ecosystem, the mainstream media and orthodox academics have decided not to consider what harm the full pursuance of zero growth or non growth might inflict on the sociotechnical system, which includes our technological infrastructure, culture, and standard of living.

### Cap Good – War

#### Free market capitalism creates the largest incentives for peace.

Bandow ‘5 (Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, November 10th, 2005, Spreading Capitalism Is Good for Peace, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/spreading-capitalism-is-good-peace)

In a world that seems constantly aflame, one naturally asks: What causes peace? Many people, including U.S. President George W. Bush, hope that spreading democracy will discourage war. But new research suggests that expanding free markets is a far more important factor, leading to what Columbia University's Erik Gartzke calls a "capitalist peace." It's a reason for even the left to support free markets.¶ The capitalist peace theory isn't new: Montesquieu and Adam Smith believed in it. Many of Britain's classical liberals, such as Richard Cobden, pushed free markets while opposing imperialism.¶ But World War I demonstrated that increased trade was not enough. The prospect of economic ruin did not prevent rampant nationalism, ethnic hatred, and security fears from trumping the power of markets.¶ An even greater conflict followed a generation later. Thankfully, World War II left war essentially unthinkable among leading industrialized - and democratic - states. Support grew for the argument, going back to Immanual Kant, that republics are less warlike than other systems.¶ Today's corollary is that creating democracies out of dictatorships will reduce conflict. This contention animated some support outside as well as inside the United States for the invasion of Iraq.¶ But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states.¶ Thus, while "democracy is desirable for many reasons," he notes in a chapter in the latest volume of Economic Freedom in the World, created by the Fraser Institute, "representative governments are unlikely to contribute directly to international peace." Capitalism is by far the more important factor.¶ The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches.¶ Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends.¶ Gartzke considers other variables, including alliance memberships, nuclear deterrence, and regional differences.¶ Although the causes of conflict vary, the relationship between economic liberty and peace remains.¶ His conclusion hasn't gone unchallenged. Author R.J. Rummel, an avid proponent of the democratic peace theory, challenges Gartzke's methodology and worries that it "may well lead intelligent and policy-wise analysts and commentators to draw the wrong conclusions about the importance of democratization."¶ Gartzke responds in detail, noting that he relied on the same data as most democratic peace theorists. If it is true that democratic states don't go to war, then it also is true that "states with advanced free market economies never go to war with each other, either."¶ The point is not that democracy is valueless. Free political systems naturally entail free elections and are more likely to protect other forms of liberty - civil and economic, for instance.¶ However, democracy alone doesn't yield peace. To believe is does is dangerous: There's no panacea for creating a conflict-free world.¶ That doesn't mean that nothing can be done. But promoting open international markets - that is, spreading capitalism - is the best means to encourage peace as well as prosperity.¶ Notes Gartzke: "Warfare among developing nations will remain unaffected by the capitalist peace as long as the economies of many developing countries remain fettered by governmental control." Freeing those economies is critical.¶ It's a particularly important lesson for the anti-capitalist left. For the most part, the enemies of economic liberty also most stridently denounce war, often in near-pacifist terms. Yet they oppose the very economic policies most likely to encourage peacIf market critics don't realize the obvious economic and philosophical value of markets - prosperity and freedom - they should appreciate the unintended peace dividend. Trade encourages prosperity and stability; technological innovation reduces the financial value of conquest; globalization creates economic interdependence, increasing the cost of war.¶ Nothing is certain in life, and people are motivated by far more than economics. But it turns out that peace is good business. And capitalism is good for peace.

#### Capitalism solves war – different avenues of competition.

Gartzke 7 (Eric, associate professor of political science and a member of the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, “The Capitalist Peace”, American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 51, No. 1, January 2007, Pp. 166–191)

If war is a product of incompatible interests and failed or abortive bargaining, peace ensues when states lack differences worthy of costly conflict, or when circumstances favor successful diplomacy. Realists and others argue that state interests are inherently incompatible, but this need be so only if state interests are narrowly defined or when conquest promises tangible benefits. Peace can result from at least three attributes of mature capitalist economies. First, the historic impetus to territorial expansion is tempered by the rising importance of intellectual and financial capital, factors that are more expediently enticed than conquered. Land does little to increase the worth of the advanced economies while resource competition is more cheaply pursued through markets than by means of military occupation. At the same time, development actually increases the ability of states to project power when incompatible policy objectives exist. Development affects who states fight (and what they fight over) more than the overall frequency of warfare. Second, substantial overlap in the foreign policy goals of developed nations in the post–World War II period further limits the scope and scale of conflict. Lacking territorial tensions, consensus about how to order the international system has allowed liberal states to cooperate and to accommodate minor differences. Whether this affinity among liberal states will persist in the next century is a question open to debate. Finally, the rise of global capital markets creates a new mechanism for competition and communication for states that might otherwise be forced to fight. Separately, these processes influence patterns of warfare in the modern world. Together, they explain the absence of war among states in the developed world and account for the dyadic observation of the democratic peace.

### Cap Sustainable

#### Capitalism is self-correcting – profit motive ensures sustainability.

Eichenwald 2 (Kurt Eichenwald, “The Nation: Clay Feet; Could Capitalists Actually Bring Down Capitalism?” 6-30-2002, Lexis-Nexis Universe)

OVER the last few centuries, capitalism has been the heartiest contender in the global bout for economic supremacy. It emerged from its decades-long death match with communism as the unquestioned victor. Its dust-up with socialism barely lasted a few rounds. It flourished in wartime, and survived wrongheaded assaults from embargoes and tariffs. Even terrorism aimed at capitalism's heart failed to deliver a knock-out punch. But now, a staggering rush of corporate debacles is raising a disturbing question: can capitalism survive the capitalists themselves? The scandals that have oozed out of corporate America with alarming regularity in recent months have repeatedly featured executives betraying the marketplace for their own short-term self-interest. From Enron to Global Crossing, Adelphia to WorldCom, the details differ but the stories boil down to the same theme: the companies lied about their performance, and investors paid the price. To those inured to corporate wrongdoing -- perhaps by the insider trading scandals or the savings and loan debacle of recent decades -- the latest scourge of white-collar malfeasance might seem like more of the same, with greedy executives cutting corners to make a profit. But in truth, the corporate calamities of the new millennium are of a different ilk, one that challenges the credibility of the financial reporting system, and in turn the faith of investors in the capital markets -- the very engine that has driven capitalism to its success. It wasn't supposed to be like this. In the wake of the stock market crash in 1929 and the ensuing revelation of the scams and rigged dealings that had helped inflate the market, America faced what appeared to be capitalism's chief vulnerability. Through Senate hearings in the early 1930's with the special counsel Ferdinand Pecora, investors learned about stock price manipulation, insider trading and profiteering through so-called investment trusts, all of which had made fortunes for the capitalists, while costing investors their savings. How did it happen? Capitalism, at its most basic, dictates that the company producing the best product at the lowest price wins. For capitalists, victory is measured solely in profits. Left to their own devices, it was clear, some capitalists would aggressively pursue profits even if it meant cheating the investors who provided all the capital. So, the game stayed the same, but the government put in referees. Congress passed the Securities Exchange Act of 1933 and 1934, and created a new federal agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission, to enforce those laws. Disclosure became the centerpiece of the system. Companies could pretty much make whatever business decision they wanted, so long as the material information was revealed to investors in periodic filings with the S.E.C. The result was an entire bulwark of protections: the board of directors entrusted with overseeing corporate managements, the independent accounting firms relied upon to insure the numbers were accurate, the government regulators in place to supervise the rules. Despite all the apparent bricks and mortar of these protections, they turned out to be as permanent and impenetrable as smoke. At bottom, the system still relied on faith -- just in someone besides the top executives or company owners. The trust was given to the competence of the directors, the integrity of the accountants and the abilities of regulators. That was evident back in 1933, when a member of Congress asked Col. A. H. Carter, senior partner of Deloitte Haskins & Sells: if accountants would be auditing the companies, who would be auditing the accountants? The reply was noble -- and proved to be hollow. "Our conscience," Colonel Carter said. By the late 90's, as is now becoming clear, that foundation of personal integrity had been eroded by easy profits. Eventually, driven by shareholder expectations and their own stock-option packages, some executives began hiding losses incurred in the faltering economy, manipulating the numbers they reported to investors. The fact that their companies are, in all probability, bad apples among many, many honest corporations makes little difference. By being deceptive on their disclosures for short-term gain, these capitalists have led investors to question the reliability of all the reported data -- and the reliability of the checks and balances instituted to keep the data valid. Not only has the accounting branch of the market been tarred by Arthur Anderson's enabling of Enron's schemes, but, from company to company, insular boards of directors, incompetent internal auditors and underfunded regulatory oversight have allowed the perception of stringent standards and protections to wither. IT is not as if corporate cheating comes out of nowhere. History holds many tales of businessmen who begin breaking the rules in boom times, when rising stock prices literally give them a sense of invincibility. Then, as the markets turn -- and they always turn -- these men try to preserve their power and wealth with more wrongdoing. They keep believing that stock prices will rise and cover their misdeeds. They really seem to think they won't get caught. This time, the crisis in investor confidence is becoming a primary policy issue for the leaders of the industrialized world -- a world largely formed on the American model, and that the United States has insisted virtually everyone else follow, too. "It's a preoccupation of all the leaders that this is creating at this time a lack of confidence in the markets, and people are not sure about the way that information is transmitted to the public," Jean Chretien, the prime minister of Canada, said on the first day of a summit of the Group of Eight leading industrialized nations. Workers are going to take it on the chin. WorldCom started laying off 17,000 people on Friday. Many more people, at many other companies, are worried. And investors -- shaken by the past and uncertain where the next disaster might emerge -- are moving their money about, dumping many stocks and moving cash into safer havens, like Treasury bonds. Could the short-term, self-rewarding mentality of a handful of capitalists truly destroy capitalism? Bring on hundreds of bankruptcies, force banks under, end the giving of loans? Destroy America as we know it? Not very likely. The system has a built-in corrective factor, which kicks in when abuses go too far. Harm to investor confidence harms the market, which harms the ability of corporations to raise the capital they need to grow and be profitable. Eventually, the capitalists' desire get investor confidence back wins the day. Already, after years of sniffing at naysayers who wagged fingers about fundamentals, investors seem to be discovering a new affection for stodgy old stock analysis. "Nobody was paying attention to seemingly boring topics like accounting and corporate governance," said Troy Paredes, an associate professor at Washington University School of Law. "People are realizing that those are the things that matter." At the same time, a range of proposals has emerged from Wall Street and Washington to overhaul corporate America. The S.E.C. is making moves to get tough on accounting standards. But still, there are some capitalists who are keeping their eyes on their short-term prize, betting that, despite all the evidence of corporate lies, investors need no substantial changes to justify keeping their confidence in the market. Many Wall Street firms are lobbying to cut back the power and authority of state securities regulators, the very individuals who historically have been particularly hard-nosed in their dedication to proper disclosure and investor protection. Meanwhile, accounting firms are doing their all to beat back efforts to strengthen their regulation. On Capitol Hill, there were rumors that tough accounting legislation was dead -- until WorldCom exploded. ULTIMATELY, capitalism will almost certainly survive this onslaught from the capitalists -- if only because survival is the most profitable outcome for all involved. Investors may well emerge wiser, less willing to jump into the latest fad and more concerned about the fundamentals. In the end, though, the experts say, that will only last as long as the memory of this period, which will wash away the next time unbridled exuberance creates a booming market. "People eventually will emerge from this more discriminating about how they invest," said David Hawkins, a professor at Harvard Business School and Merrill Lynch's accounting consultant. "But this isn't the last time we'll go through this. People will forget, and it will all happen again."

### No Alternative

#### Alternatives to capitalism fail – lack of individual choice results in tyranny or failure

Meltzer 9, Professor of Political Economy at Carnegie Mellon University’s School of Business, Visiting Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, First Recipient of the AEI Irving Kristol Award, and Chairman of the International Financial Institution Advisory Commission, (Allan, March 12, “Why Capitalism?” 2008-2009 Bradley Lecture Series, http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.29525,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp)

Alternatives to Capitalism Critics of capitalism emphasize their dislike of greed and self-interest. They talk a great deal about social justice and fairness, but they do not propose an acceptable alternative to achieve their ends. The alternatives that have been tried are types of Socialism or Communism or other types of authoritarian rule. Anti-capitalist proposals suffer from two crippling drawbacks. First, they ignore the Kantian principle about human imperfection. Second, they ignore individual differences. In place of individual choice under capitalism, they substitute rigid direction done to achieve some proclaimed end such as equality, fairness, or justice. These ends are not precise and, most important, individuals differ about what is fair and just. In practice, the rulers' choices are enforced, often using fear, terror, prison, or other punishment. The history of the twentieth century illustrates how enforcement of promised ends became the justification for deplorable means. And the ends were not realized. Transferring resource allocation decisions to government bureaus does not eliminate crime, greed, self-dealing, conflict of interest, and corruption. Experience tells us these problems remain. The form may change, but as Kant recognized, the problems continue. Ludwig von Mises recognized in the 1920s that fixing prices and planning resource use omitted an essential part of the allocation problem. Capitalism allocates by letting relative prices adjust to equal the tradeoffs expressed by buyers' demands. Fixing prices eliminates the possibility of efficient allocation and replaces consumer choice with official decisions. Some gain, but others lose; the losers want to make choices other than those that are dictated to them. Not all Socialist societies have been brutal. In the nineteenth century, followers of Robert Owen, the Amana people, and many others chose a Socialist system. Israeli pioneers chose a collectivist system, the kibbutz. None of these arrangements produced sustainable growth. None survived. All faced the problem of imposing allocative decisions that satisfied the decision-making group, sometimes a majority, often not. Capitalism recognizes that where individual wants differ, the market responds to the mass; minorities are free to develop their favored outcome. Walk down the aisles of a modern supermarket. There are products that satisfy many different tastes or beliefs. Theodor Adorno was a leading critic of postwar capitalism as it developed in his native Germany, in Europe, and in the United States. He found the popular culture vulgar, and he distrusted the workers' choices. He wanted a Socialism that he hoped would uphold the values he shared with other intellectuals. Capitalism, he said, valued work too highly and true leisure too little. He disliked jazz, so he was not opposed to Hitler's ban in the 1930s. But Adorno offered no way of achieving the culture he desired other than to impose his tastes on others and ban all choices he disliked. This appealed to people who shared his view. Many preferred American pop culture whenever they had the right to choose. Capitalism permits choices and the freedom to make them. Some radio stations play jazz, some offer opera and symphonies, and many play pop music. Under capitalism, advertisers choose what they sponsor, and they sponsor programs that people choose to hear or watch. Under Socialism, the public watches and hears what someone chooses for them. The public had little choice. In Western Europe change did not come until boats outside territorial limits offered choice. The Templeton Foundation recently ran an advertisement reporting the answers several prominent intellectuals gave to the question: "Does the free market corrode moral character?" Several respondents recognized that free markets operate within a political system, a legal framework, and the rule of law. The slave trade and slavery became illegal in the nineteenth century. Before this a majority enslaved a minority. This is a major blot on the morality of democratic choice that public opinion and the law eventually removed. In the United States those who benefitted did not abandon slave owning until forced by a war. Most respondents to the Templeton question took a mixed stand. The philosopher John Gray recognized that greed and envy are driving forces under capitalism, but they often produce growth and raise living standards so that many benefit. But greed leads to outcomes like Enron and WorldCom that critics take as a characteristic of the system rather than as a characteristic of some individuals that remains under Socialism. Michael Walzer recognized that political activity also corrodes moral character, but he claimed it was regulated more effectively. One of the respondents discussed whether capitalism was more or less likely to foster or sustain moral abuses than other social arrangements. Bernard-Henri Levy maintained that alternatives to the market such as fascism and Communism were far worse. None of the respondents mentioned Kant's view that mankind includes a range of individuals who differ in their moral character. Institutional and social arrangements like democracy and capitalism influence the moral choices individuals make or reject. No democratic capitalist country produced any crimes comparable to the murders committed by Hitler's Germany, Mao's China, or Lenin and Stalin's Soviet Union. As Lord Acton warned, concentrated power corrupts officials. Some use concentrated power to impose their will. Some allow their comrades to act as tyrants. Others proclaim that ends such as equality justify force to control opposition. Communism proclaimed a vision of equality that it never approached. It was unattainable because individuals differ about what is good. And what is good to them and for them is not the same as what is socially desirable to critics of capitalism. Kant's principle warns that utopian visions are unattainable. Capitalism does not offer a vision of perfection and harmony. Democratic capitalism combines freedom, opportunity, growth, and progress with restrictions on less desirable behavior. It creates societies that treat men and women as they are, not as in some utopian vision. In The Open Society and Its Enemies, Karl Popper showed why utopian visions become totalitarian. All deviations from the utopian ideal must be prevented. The Enrons, WorldComs, and others of that kind show that dishonest individuals rise along with honest individuals. Those who use these examples to criticize capitalism do not use the same standard to criticize all governments as failed arrangements when a Watergate or bribery is uncovered. Nor do they criticize government when politicians promise but do not produce or achieve. We live after twenty-five to forty years of talk about energy, education, healthcare, and drugs. Governments promise and propose, but little if any progress is visible on these issues.

### Alt Fails – Transition Wars

#### Capitalist elites will resist the alt, causing global transition wars

Harris 2 [Lee, Policy Review, December, p3(13) The intellectual origins of America-Bashing]

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, a full-fledged civil war not just within one society, but across the globe.

### Alt Fails – Totalizing

#### Total rejection of capitalism fragments resistance and makes it impossible to overcome a universalized system.

Gibson-Graham 96 (Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson, Professor of Culture & Society @ University of West Sydney, “The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy”, 1996)

One of our goals as Marxists has been to produce a knowledge of capitalism. Yet as “that which is known,” Capitalism has become the intimate enemy. We have uncloaked the ideologically-clothed, obscure monster, but we have installed a naked and visible monster in its place. In return for our labors of creation, the monster has robbed us of all force. We hear – and find it easy to believe – that the left is in disarray. Part of what produces the disarray of the left is the vision of what the left is arrayed against. When capitalism is represented as a unified system coextensive with the nation or even the world, when it is portrayed as crowding out all other economic forms, when it is allowed to define entire societies, it becomes something that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement (or by a process of systemic dissolution that such a movement might assist). The revolutionary task of replacing capitalism now seems outmoded and unrealistic, yet we do not seem to have an alternative conception of class transformation to take its place. The old political economic “systems” and “structures” that call forth a vision of revolution as systemic replacement still seem to be dominant in the Marxist political imagination. The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could being to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conception under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change.

### Alt Fails – Violence

#### Alternatives to Capitalism lead to Violence.

Rummel 4– prof. emeritus of political science at the University of Hawaii [Rudolph, The Killing Machine that is Marxism, Online]

Of all religions, secular and otherwise, that of Marxism has been by far the bloodiest – bloodier than the Catholic Inquisition, the various Catholic crusades, and the Thirty Years War between Catholics and Protestants. In practice, Marxism has meant bloody terrorism, deadly purges, lethal prison camps and murderous forced labor, fatal deportations, man-made famines, extrajudicial executions and fraudulent show trials, outright mass murder and genocide. In total, Marxist regimes murdered nearly 110 million people from 1917 to 1987. For perspective on this incredible toll, note that all domestic and foreign wars during the 20th century killed around 35 million. That is, when Marxists control states, Marxism is more deadly then all the wars of the 20th century, including World Wars I and II, and the Korean and Vietnam Wars. And what did Marxism, this greatest of human social experiments, achieve for its poor citizens, at this most bloody cost in lives? Nothing positive. It left in its wake an economic, environmental, social and cultural disaster. The Khmer Rouge – (Cambodian communists) who ruled Cambodia for four years – provide insight into why Marxists believed it necessary and moral to massacre so many of their fellow humans. Their Marxism was married to absolute power. They believed without a shred of doubt that they knew the truth, that they would bring about the greatest human welfare and happiness, and that to realize this utopia, they had to mercilessly tear down the old feudal or capitalist order and Buddhist culture, and then totally rebuild a communist society. Nothing could be allowed to stand in the way of this achievement. Government – the Communist Party – was above any law. All other institutions, religions, cultural norms, traditions and sentiments were expendable. The Marxists saw the construction of this utopia as a war on poverty, exploitation, imperialism and inequality – and, as in a real war, noncombatants would unfortunately get caught in the battle. There would be necessary enemy casualties: the clergy, bourgeoisie, capitalists, "wreckers," intellectuals, counterrevolutionaries, rightists, tyrants, the rich and landlords. As in a war, millions might die, but these deaths would be justified by the end, as in the defeat of Hitler in World War II. To the ruling Marxists, the goal of a communist utopia was enough to justify all the deaths. The irony is that in practice, even after decades of total control, Marxism did not improve the lot of the average person, but usually made living conditions worse than before the revolution. It is not by chance that the world's greatest famines have happened within the Soviet Union (about 5 million dead from 1921-23 and 7 million from 1932-3, including 2 million outside Ukraine) and communist China (about 30 million dead from 1959-61). Overall, in the last century almost 55 million people died in various Marxist famines and associated epidemics – a little over 10 million of them were intentionally starved to death, and the rest died as an unintended result of Marxist collectivization and agricultural policies. What is astonishing is that this "currency" of death by Marxism is not thousands or even hundreds of thousands, but millions of deaths. This is almost incomprehensible – it is as though the whole population of the American New England and Middle Atlantic States, or California and Texas, had been wiped out. And that around 35 million people escaped Marxist countries as refugees was an unequaled vote against Marxist utopian pretensions.

### Cede the Political

#### Un-pragmatic anti-capitalist rhetoric strengthens the right and prevents change.

Wilson 2K-coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, author of lots of books [John K, How the left can win arguments and influence people: a tactical manual for pragmatic progressives, 2000, pg. 13-14]

**Unfortunately, progressives spend most of their time attacking capitalism rather than taking credit for all the reforms that led to America’s economic growth. If Americans were convinced that social programs and investment in people** (rather than corporate welfare and investment in weaponry) **helped create the current economic growth, they would be far more willing to pursue additional progressive policies. Instead, the left allows conservatives to dismiss these social investments as “too costly” or “big government.” It is crucial not to allow the right to define these progressive programs as “anticapitalist” and then attempt to destroy them. The Reagan/Gingrich/Clinton era’s attempt to “get the government off our back” was an effort** (fortunately, largely a failure) **to corrupt the highly successful progressive capitalism in America.** While the Reagan/Gingrich/Clinton “**reforms” subsidized the dramatic growth in the wealth of the richest Americans and had a devastating impact on the very poor,** they didn’t change the basic institutions of progressive capitalism. **It may take several generations to recover from the damage done** to the poor, **but even the far right has been unable** (so far) **to destroy progressive middle-class institutions such as Social Security or public schools.**

### Framework

#### Role of the ballot is to evaluate the desirability of the plan based on hypothetical consideration of the consequences of the plan being enacted.

#### Debate is process for learning how to make better decisions – our decisions affect our own lives and the lives of those around us. Simply discussing the capitalist system, and neglecting the political process turns us into spectators who are powerless to produce real change.

Rorty 98 – professor emeritus of comparative literature and philosophy, by courtesy, at Stanford University (Richard, “ACHIEVING OUR COUNTRY: Leftist Thought in Twentieth-Century America”, 1998, Pg. 7-9)

Such people find pride in American citizenship impossi­ble, and vigorous participation in electoral politics pointless. They associate American patriotism with an endorsement of atrocities: the importation of African slaves, the slaughter of Native Americans, the rape of ancient forests, and the Viet­nam War. Many of them think of national pride as appropri­ate only for chauvinists: for the sort of American who re­joices that America can still orchestrate something like the Gulf War, can still bring deadly force to bear whenever and wherever it chooses. **When young intellectuals** watch John Wayne war movies **after reading Heidegger, Foucault, Stephenson, or Silko, they often become convinced that they live in a violent, inhuman, corrupt country. They begin to think of themselves as a saving remnant-as the happy few who have the insight to see through nationalist rhetoric to the ghastly reality of contemporary America. But this insight does not move them to formulate a legislative program, to join a political movement, or to share in a national hope.** The contrast between national hope and national self­-mockery and self-disgust becomes vivid when one compares novels like Snow Crash and Almanac of the Dead with socialist novels of the first half of the century-books like The Jungle, An American Tragedy, and The Grapes of Wrath. The latter were written in the belief that the tone of the Gettysburg Address was absolutely right, but that our country would have to transform itself in order to fulfill Lincoln's hopes. Transfor­mation would be needed because the rise of industrial capi­talism had made the individualist rhetoric of America's first century obsolete. The authors of these novels thought that this rhetoric should be replaced by one in which America is destined to become the first cooperative commonwealth, the first class­less society. This America would be one in which income and wealth are equitably distributed, and in which the govern­ment ensures equality of opportunity as well as individual liberty. This new, quasi-communitarian rhetoric was at the heart of the Progressive Movement and the New Deal. It set the tone for the American Left during the first six decades of the twentieth century. Walt Whitman and John Dewey, as we shall see, did a great deal to shape this rhetoric. The difference between early twentieth-century leftist in­tellectuals and the majority of their contemporary counter­parts is the difference between agents and spectators. **In the early decades of this century, when an intellectual stepped back from his or her country's history and looked at it through skeptical eyes, the chances were that he or she was about to propose a** **new political initiative**. Henry Adams was, of course, the great exception-the great abstainer from ·politics. But William James thought that Adams' diagnosis of the First Gilded Age as a symptom of irreversible moral and political decline was merely perverse. James's pragmatist theory of truth was in part a reaction against the sort of de­tached spectators hip which Adams affected. For James, **disgust with American hypocrisy and self­-deception was pointless unless accompanied by an effort to give America reason to be proud of itself in the future. The kind of proto- Heideggerian cultural pessimism which Adams cultivated seemed**, to James, **decadent and cowardly. "Democracy," James wrote, "is a kind of religion, and we are bound not to admit its failure. Faiths and utopias are the no­blest exercise of human reason, and no one with a spark of reason in him will sit down fatalistically before the croaker's picture. "2**